arXiv:1603.00217v1 [math.PR] 1 Mar 2016

A CLASS OF GLOBALLY SOLVABLE MARKOVIAN QUADRATIC BSDE SYSTEMS AND APPLICATIONS

HAO XING AND GORDAN ŽITKOVIĆ

ABSTRACT. We establish existence and uniqueness for a wide class of Markovian systems of backward stochastic differential equations (BSDE) with quadratic nonlinearities. This class is characterized by an abstract structural assumption on the generator, an a-priori local-boundedness property, and a locally-Hölder-continuous terminal condition. We present easily verifiable sufficient conditions for these assumptions and treat several applications, including stochastic equilibria in incomplete financial markets, stochastic differential games, and martingales on Riemannian manifolds.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **Backward Stochastic Differential Equations.** Having appeared first in their linear variant in [Bis73], backward stochastic differential equations (BSDE) have been a subject of extensive study since the seminal paper [PP90]. Given a time horizon $T \in (0, \infty)$ and a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\in[0,T]}, \mathbb{P})$ which satisfies the usual conditions, these equations take the following form

$$\boldsymbol{Y}_t = \boldsymbol{G} + \int_t^T \boldsymbol{f}(s, \boldsymbol{Y}_s, \boldsymbol{Z}_s)\, ds + \int_t^T \boldsymbol{Z}_s\, dW_s, \tag{1.1}$$

where W is a d-dimensional $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\in[0,T]}$-Brownian motion, $\boldsymbol{G} \in \mathcal{F}_T$ an N-dimensional random vector and $\boldsymbol{f}$ a (possibly random) function, called the generator. A solution to such an equation is a pair $(\boldsymbol{Y}, \boldsymbol{Z})$ consisting of an N-dimensional semimartingale $\boldsymbol{Y}$ and an $N \times d$-dimensional adapted process $\boldsymbol{Z}$ which, together, satisfy (1.1) pathwise, a.s.

The existence- and uniqueness theory is well developed in the scalar ($N = 1$) setting. It originated with the Lipschitz-generator case treated in [PP90], continued in [LSM97] for merely continuous generators with linear growth, and culminated with the treatment of quadratic nonlinearities in [Kob00] and superquadratic nonlinearities in [DHB11]. A host of extensions, simplifications, and applications, too numerous to list here, appeared in the literature since.

On the other hand, systems ($N > 1$) of BSDE - the focus of the present paper - pose a greater challenge. Their successful treatment is one of the most important (and long-standing) open problems in the entire theory, as mentioned already by Peng in [Pen99]. While the case of a Lipschitz generator was treated already in [PP90], the general, nonlinear, quadratically-growing case is still open. One of the most well-known general-purpose results has been established in [Tev08], where

Date: March 2, 2016.

The authors are grateful to Ying Hu for inspiring discussions. The second author acknowledges the support by the National Science Foundation under Grants No. DMS-0706947 (2010 - 2015), No. DMS-1107465 (2012 - 2017) and No. DMS-1516165 (2015-2018). Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation (NSF).

the generator has general quadratic growth, but the terminal condition is subject to a restrictive "smallness" assumption imposed on its $\mathbb{L}^\infty$-norm. As is the case in the theory of systems of parabolic PDEs with quadratic nonlinearities, a smallness assumption is often made and seems to be necessary for existence in full generality, in absence of any further, structural assumptions; cf. [Str81] and [CDY92]. A simple nonexistence example given in [FdR11] illustrates this point quite effectively.

Positive results without any smallness assumptions have been established in some special cases. Focusing only on the general existence results in the multidimensional case pertinent to our findings, let us mention just a few: [Tan03] deals with linear-quadratic systems, [CN15] builds a structure around the ability to change the probability measure in the Markovian case, and in [HT15], a slightly less general, "diagonally"-quadratic case is treated, but without the Markovian assumption.

Our present work was motivated not only by the unresolved status of the basic existence and uniqueness problems for quadratic systems of BSDE, but also by a number of applications such systems have. Indeed, in addition to their innate mathematical interest, BSDE appear in numerous applications, including stochastic representations for partial differential equations, optimal stochastic control and stochastic games (see, e.g. [EKH03], [CHKP14], [ET15], and [KP16]). Moreover, as has been shown in [KXŽ15], arguably the most important open problem in stochastic financial economics - namely, the so-called incomplete-market equilibrium problem - can be reduced to a quadratic system of BSDE (which we solve in the present paper). Quadratic systems of BSDE also appear in geometry, most prominently in the study of harmonic functions between manifolds and the construction of martingales on curved spaces, (see, e.g., [Dar95], [Bla05] and [Bla06]).

1.2. **Our contributions - the main result.** We focus on a Markovian framework, where the randomness in the generator and the terminal condition is supplied by a (forward) d-dimensional non-degenerate diffusion X. Our terminal condition is of the form $\boldsymbol{G} = \boldsymbol{g}(X_T)$ and the generator $\boldsymbol{f}(t, X_t, \boldsymbol{Y}_t, \boldsymbol{Z}_t)$ grows at most quadratically in $\boldsymbol{Z}$. We formulate and work with a novel structural condition on $\boldsymbol{f}$ which requires the existence of what we term a *Lyapunov function*. Loosely speaking, a Lyapunov function h has the property that $h(\boldsymbol{Y})$ is a "strict" submartingale, a-priori, for any solution $\boldsymbol{Y}$ of (1.1) (actually, we consider a pair of functions, but we focus on only one of them in this introduction). Under the quadratic-growth assumption, Lyapunov functions always exist in the 1-dimensional case and can be found in the class of exponential functions; this explains the success of the exponential transform in the 1-dimensional setting. The multidimensional case appears to be much more difficult, but as we show, widely applicable sufficient conditions can be given.

Our main result states that when a Lyapunov function exists and an additional a-priori local-boundedness condition holds, the equation (1.1) admits a Markovian solution as soon as $\boldsymbol{g}$ belongs to an appropriately-defined local Hölder space, *without any assumptions of the "smallness" type* on the terminal condition, the driver, or the time horizon. Moreover, under an additional mild assumption, this solution turns out to be unique in a wide class of stochastic processes.

In contrast to the bulk of the literature on multidimensional BSDE, we rely on deep analytic results for systems of PDEs and combine them with probabilistic techniques. More precisely, we use powerful ideas first introduced to study regularity theory for systems of parabolic PDEs, most

notably the so-called *partial-regularity* estimates and the *hole-filling* technique of [Wid71], initially developed for elliptic systems and later extended to parabolic systems of PDEs in [Str81]. We represent this analytic theory entirely in a probabilistic fashion. This not only reduces some technical estimates in the analytic counterpart, but also allows us to treat systems which are not necessarily of divergence form. Partial-regularity and hole-filling techniques can be seen as a replacement for order-based arguments involving, for instance, the maximum principle (comparison principle) or the related notion of a viscosity solution; such methods, unfortunately, fail miserably in the multidimensional case (see [HP06]).

A major difficulty in adopting the techniques from the theory of systems of PDE lies in the choice of the regularity class of the Markov representatives, i.e., functions $\boldsymbol{v}$ such that $\boldsymbol{Y}_t = \boldsymbol{v}(t, X_t)$ is a solution. On one hand, the classical notion of a weak solution - typically a starting point for any regularity analysis in the PDE world - is too weak for us; indeed, the very definition of a solution to a BSDE requires $\boldsymbol{Y}$ to be a semimartingale (see, however, [BL97], [BM01], [Lej02], and [MX08] for developments in Lipschitz systems). On the opposite end of the spectrum, a classical $C^{1,2}$-solution would, indeed, guarantee the semimartingale property of $\boldsymbol{v}(t, X_t)$, but one can hardly expect that kind of regularity from a solution to a nonlinear system. In the one-dimensional case, the situation is fully understood - Markov representatives of solutions to Markovian BSDE in dimension 1 are viscosity solutions to the associated quasilinear PDEs (see [PP92], [Kob00], [BH08] or [DHB11]). The multidimensional case, again, presents major difficulties: unless the system is very weakly coupled (only in its zero-th order terms), there is no natural notion of a viscosity solution and there is no corresponding characterization of the class of semimartingale functions (see, however, [CM97] for a related result in the Brownian case). However, in many applications, the automatic semimartingale property is especially useful, as it allows us to perform so-called "verification" directly and without additional assumptions or the invocation of the dynamic-programming principle.

The way we overcame these difficulties in the present paper is by: 1) approximating our system by a sequence of well-behaved systems, 2) combining analytic methods described above with probabilistic ones to obtain adequate uniform estimates on these approximations, and 3) showing that the passage to the limit preserves the semimartingale property (as well as the equation itself), while relying mostly on probabilistic arguments. This way, we obtain a solution of the form $\boldsymbol{Y}_t = \boldsymbol{v}(t, X_t)$, $\boldsymbol{Z}_t = \boldsymbol{w}(t, X_t)$, where $\boldsymbol{v}$ is locally Hölder continuous, $\boldsymbol{v}(t, X_t)$ is a semimartingale, and $\boldsymbol{w}$ is the weak Jacobian of $\boldsymbol{v}$. While we are still far from a complete understanding of the appropriate class of functions to replace viscosity solutions in the multidimensional case, we feel that the functions with above properties constitute a promising first step.

1.3. **Our results - sufficient conditions and examples.** As a complement to our main existence/uniqueness theorem, we provide a a sufficient condition for the existence of Lyapunov functions - termed the Bensoussan-Frehse (BF) condition - as well as a somewhat simpler sufficient condition for a-priori boundedness. The names of Bensoussan and Frehse are associated to this condition due to a set of assumptions these authors place on the Hamiltonian of a particular system of parabolic PDE in [BF02a]. A generalized version of these assumptions became our condition (BF) - a list of algebraic conditions on various terms in the generator. While one of them allows for any function of

sub-quadratic growth, all the others deal with quadratic expressions with a specific structure (we even allow for a small "error" around the condition (BF), thus incorporating both "smallness" and structural requirements into a single condition.) To the best of our knowledge, generators in all solvable Markovian BSDE systems described in the literature so far satisfy our condition (BF).

We illustrate our main results and the sufficient conditions with a number of examples. Our first example shows that the stochastic equilibria exist and are unique in a class of incomplete financial market models, with heterogeneous "exponential" agents. Next, we construct a class of martingales on differential manifolds with connections under fewer assumptions than before. Then, we treat two non-zero sum stochastic games, namely, a game with "cooperation and hindrance", and a risk-sensitive stochastic differential game; we show that Nash equilibria exist in both. Our final example focuses on a different aspect of our results and treats a one-dimensional equation.

1.4. **Structure of the paper.** After this introduction, we describe the setting and state our main theorem and various sufficient conditions for its assumptions in section 2. Section 3 contains examples, while the proofs are divided between two sections: section 4 deals with Hölder boundedness and contains the bulk of the partial-regularity and hole-filling estimates, while all the other proofs are collected in section 5.

1.5. **Notation and conventions.** For a scalar function u, Du denotes its ($\mathbb{R}^d$-valued) spatial gradient, interpreted as a row vector, while D^2u denotes its (spatial) Hessian matrix. Individual spatial partial derivatives of are denoted by subscripts, i.e., $D_iu = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}u$ and $D_{ij}u$ stands for $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^i \partial x^j}u$. In the vectorial ($\mathbb{R}^N$-valued) case - which we mark by bold symbols - $D\boldsymbol{u}$ is understood as the $\mathbb{R}^{N\times d}$-Jacobian matrix.

We will also have occasion to evaluate bilinear forms on function gradients; for a $d\times d$ matrix S we write $\langle Du, Dw\rangle_S = \sum_{ij} D_iuD_jwS_{ij} = DuSDw^\top$. More generally, for a square matrix S and two matrices A and B of appropriate dimensions, we write $\langle A, B\rangle_S$ for the matrix $ASB^\top$. The Frobenious product of matrices is denoted by $A : B$, i.e., for square matrices A and B of the same dimension, we define $A : B = \sum_{ij} A_{ij}B_{ij} = \mathrm{Tr}(A^\top B)$. The Frobenius norm of a square matrix A is given by $\sqrt{A : A}$.

The notation $|\cdot|$ is used both for the Lebesgue measure of a subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$, as well as for the Euclidean norm in any Euclidean space; it should be interpreted as the Frobenius norm, in case its argument is a matrix. For $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d$, we use an anisotropic norm, namely, we set $|(t, x)| = \max(\sqrt{|t|}, |x|)$. The ball of radius R around x in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is denoted by $B_R(x)$. In the special case when $x = 0$ and $R = n \in \mathbb{N}$, we use simply B_n.

The notation $||\cdot||$ will be reserved for infinite-dimensional spaces. More specifically, unless defined otherwise, $||\cdot||$ stands for the $\mathbb{L}^2$-norm, both on the underlying probability space, and on an appropriate domain.

For $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and a (generally matrix-valued) process $(\boldsymbol{Z}_u)_{u\in[t,T]}$, we write $\boldsymbol{Z} \in \mathcal{P}^r$ if $\int_t^T |\boldsymbol{Z}_u|^r\, du < \infty$, a.s. The stochastic integral $\int \boldsymbol{Z}_s\, dW_s$ of $\boldsymbol{Z} \in \mathcal{P}^2$ with respect to a vector Brownian motion W, defines a vector-valued process whose i-th component is given by $\sum_j \int \boldsymbol{Z}^{ij}_s\, dW^j_s$. We write $\boldsymbol{Z} \in$ bmo if $\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} ||\mathbb{E}_\tau[\int_\tau^T |\boldsymbol{Z}_u|^2 du]||_{\mathbb{L}^\infty} < \infty$, where $\mathcal{T}$ is the set of $[0, T]$-valued stopping times and $\mathbb{E}_\tau$ denotes the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}[\cdot|\mathcal{F}_\tau]$ with respect to $\mathcal{F}_\tau$. The notation $dF \overset{m}{=} \alpha$

means $F - \int_0^{\cdot} \alpha_s \, ds$ is a local martingale. Standard localization techniques and boundedness of processes involved can be used to show that all local martingales in the sequel can be treated as martingales effectively, therefore we will treat them as such without explicit mention.

For $\alpha \in (0,1]$, a compact subset K of $\mathbb{R}^d$ and a function $\boldsymbol{v} : [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^N$, the Hölder seminorm $[\boldsymbol{v}]_{\alpha,K}$ is defined by

$$[\boldsymbol{v}]_{\alpha,K} = \sup_{(t',x') \neq (t,x) \in [0,T] \times K} \frac{|\boldsymbol{v}(t',x') - \boldsymbol{v}(t,x)|}{|(t,x) - (t',x')|^{\alpha}}. \tag{1.2}$$

Sequences are denoted by curly brackets $\{\cdot\}$. The index $n \in \mathbb{N}$ or $m \in \mathbb{N}$ is usually omitted and will always be clear from the context.

2. Main results

2.1. **The setup, standing assumptions and key concepts.**

2.1.1. *The driving diffusion.* We work on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_T, \mathbb{P})$, on which a d-dimensional Brownian motion $(W_t)_{t \in [0,T]}$ is defined. With $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)$ denoting the argumented filtration generated by W, we consider the stochastic differential equation

$$dX_t = b(t, X_t)dt + \sigma(t, X_t)dW_t, \tag{2.1}$$

where

(1) the drift vector $b : [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is uniformly bounded,
(2) the dispersion matrix $\sigma : [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is symmetric and there exist a constant $\Lambda > 0$ such that $\Lambda |z|^2 \geq |z\sigma(t,x)|^2 \geq \frac{1}{\Lambda} |z|^2$, for all $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and all $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and
(3) there exists a constant L such that, for all $t \in [0,T], x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have

$$|b(t,x) - b(t,x')| + |\sigma(t,x) - \sigma(t,x')| \leq L |x - x'| .$$

These conditions ensure, in particular, that for each $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$, there exists a unique strong solution $(X_u^{t,x})_{u \in [t,T]}$ of (2.1), defined on $[t,T]$, such that $X_t^{t,x} = x$. For notational reasons, we extend $X^{t,x}$ by setting $X_u^{t,x} = x$, for $u \in [0,t)$, and denote by $\mathbb{P}^{t,x}$ its law on the canonical space $C^d[0,T]$.

2.1.2. *Markovian and Hölderian Solutions.* Given a sequence $\{\alpha_n\}$ in $(0,1]$, a sequence $\{\boldsymbol{v}^m\}$ is said to be **bounded in** $C_{loc}^{\{\alpha_n\}}([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ if there exists a sequence $\{c_n\}$ of positive constants, such that, for all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$||\boldsymbol{v}^m||_{\mathbb{L}^\infty([0,T] \times B_n)} + [\boldsymbol{v}^m]_{\alpha_n, B_n} \leq c_n.$$

We write $\boldsymbol{v} \in C_{loc}^{\{\alpha_n\}}$ if the constant sequence $\{\boldsymbol{v}\}$ is bounded in $C_{loc}^{\{\alpha_n\}}$. A completely analogous construction yields the family of local Hölder spaces $C_{loc}^{\{\alpha_n\}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ over $\mathbb{R}^d$ instead of $[0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Various spaces of continuously (non-fractionally) differentiable functions are defined in the standard manner.

Definition 2.1 (A Markovian solution to BSDE)**.** Given Borel functions $\boldsymbol{f} : [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^{N\times d} \to \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\boldsymbol{g} : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^N$, a pair $(\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{w})$ of Borel functions with the domain $[0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and co-domains $\mathbb{R}^N$ and $\mathbb{R}^{N\times d}$, respectively, is a called a **Markovian solution** to the **system**

$$d\boldsymbol{Y}_t = -\boldsymbol{f}(t, X_t, \boldsymbol{Y}_t, \boldsymbol{Z}_t)\, dt + \boldsymbol{Z}_t \sigma(t, X_t)\, dW_t, \quad \boldsymbol{Y}_T = \boldsymbol{g}(X_T), \tag{2.2}$$

of **backward stochastic differential equations** if, for all $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$,

(1) $\boldsymbol{Y}^{t,x} := \boldsymbol{v}(\cdot, X^{t,x})$ is a continuous process, $\boldsymbol{Z}^{t,x} := \boldsymbol{w}(\cdot, X^{t,x}) \in \mathcal{P}^2$, and $\boldsymbol{f}(\cdot, X^{t,x}, \boldsymbol{Y}^{t,x}, \boldsymbol{Z}^{t,x}) \in \mathcal{P}^1$,
(2) For all $t' \in [t,T]$, we have

$$\boldsymbol{Y}^{t,x}_{t'} = \boldsymbol{g}(X^{t,x}_T) + \int_{t'}^T \boldsymbol{f}(u, X^{t,x}_u, \boldsymbol{Y}^{t,x}_u, \boldsymbol{Z}^{t,x}_u)du - \int_{t'}^T \boldsymbol{Z}^{t,x}_u \sigma(u, X^{t,x}_u) dW_u, \text{ a.s.}$$

A Markovian solution $(\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{w})$ to (2.2) is said to be **bounded** if $\boldsymbol{v}$ is bounded, **continuous** if $\boldsymbol{v}$ is continuous, **locally Hölderian** if $\boldsymbol{v} \in C^{\{\alpha_n\}}_{loc}$, for some sequence $\{\alpha_n\}$ in $(0,1]$, and a **bmo-solution** if $\boldsymbol{Z}^{t,x} \in$ bmo for all $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$.

Remark 2.2. For Markovian BSDE, it is customary to consider the generator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{f}}(t,x,\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{z}\sigma)$ instead of our $\boldsymbol{f}(t,x,\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{z})$. Due to our assumptions on σ, these are equivalent and we maintain the generator as $\boldsymbol{f}$ for notational convenience later on.

2.1.3. *Lyapunov functions.* The key condition in our main result below concerns the existence of sequence of functions which we term the Lyapunov functions. We abbreviate $a = \sigma\sigma^\top$, define $\langle \boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{z} \rangle_{a(t,x)} = \boldsymbol{z}\sigma(t,x)(\boldsymbol{z}\sigma(t,x))^\top$, and remind the reader that $B_n = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x| \le n\}$.

Definition 2.3 (Lyapunov functions)**.** Let $\boldsymbol{f} : [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^{N\times d} \to \mathbb{R}^N$ be a Borel function and let $c > 0$ be a constant. A pair (h,k) of nonnegative functions, with $h \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and k Borel, is said to be a c-**Lyapunuov pair** for $\boldsymbol{f}$ if $h(\mathbf{0}) = 0, Dh(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0}$, and

$$\tfrac{1}{2} D^2 h(\boldsymbol{y}) : \langle \boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{z} \rangle_{a(t,x)} - Dh(\boldsymbol{y}) \boldsymbol{f}(t,x,\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{z}) \ge |\boldsymbol{z}|^2 - k(t,x), \tag{2.3}$$

for all $(t,x,\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{z}) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^{N\times d}$, with $|\boldsymbol{y}| \le c$. We write $(h,k) \in \mathbf{Ly}(\boldsymbol{f}, c)$.

Given a sequence $\{c_n\}$ of positive constants, a pair $(\{h_n\}, \{k_n\})$ of sequences of nonnegative functions, with $h_n \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and k_n Borel, is called a **local** $\{c_n\}$**-Lyapunov pair for** $\boldsymbol{f}$, if $h_n(\mathbf{0}) = 0, Dh_n(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0}$ and

$$\tfrac{1}{2} D^2 h_n(\boldsymbol{y}) : \langle \boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{z} \rangle_{a(t,x)} - Dh_n(\boldsymbol{y}) \boldsymbol{f}(t,x,\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{z}) \ge |\boldsymbol{z}|^2 - k_n(t,x), \tag{2.4}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $(t,x,\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{z}) \in [0,T] \times B_n \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^{N\times d}$, with $|\boldsymbol{y}| \le c_n$. We write $(\{h_n\}, \{k_n\}) \in \mathbf{Ly}_{loc}(\boldsymbol{f}, \{c_n\})$.

Remark 2.4.

(1) Suppose that the process $\boldsymbol{Y}$ has a semimartingale decomposition as in (2.2) (i.e., solves the BSDE system) and satisfies the bound $|\boldsymbol{Y}| \le c$. A function h for which (2.3) holds has the property that $h(\boldsymbol{Y}_t)$ is a semimartingale with the finite variation part dominating (in the increasing order) the process $\int_0^\cdot \left(|\boldsymbol{Z}_u|^2 - k(u, X_u) \right) du$. The function k will often be constant, but certain applications require more flexibility. If one wants to deal with

unbounded $\boldsymbol{Y}$, a layer of localization - expressed through the dependence on n and the sequence $\{c_n\}$ in the local version - is necessary.

(2) It is interesting to note that in the scalar case ($N = 1$), and when the generator $\boldsymbol{f}$ grows at most quadratically in $\boldsymbol{z}$, it is essentially sufficient to look for Lyapunov pairs with $h(y) = \exp(\alpha y)$, for large enough α. As we shall see below, this no longer works in the vector case, which leads to nontrivial constructions of Lyapunov pairs under specific structural conditions.

2.2. **A uniform estimate.** The first main result of the paper, contained in Theorem 2.5 below, provides an abstract stencil for a uniform estimate for a family of BSDE systems under several assumptions, most notable of which is the existence of a Lyapunov pair, uniform for all systems in the family. Sufficient conditions for these assumptions and examples will be given shortly.

Theorem 2.5 (Uniform estimate)**.** *Let $\{\boldsymbol{f}^m\}$ and $\{\boldsymbol{g}^m\}$ be sequences of Borel functions $\boldsymbol{f}^m : [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^{N\times d} \to \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\boldsymbol{g}^m : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^N$ such that, for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, the BSDE system*

$$d\boldsymbol{Y}_t = -\boldsymbol{f}^m(t, X_t, \boldsymbol{Y}_t, \boldsymbol{Z}_t)\, dt + \boldsymbol{Z}_t \sigma(t, X_t)\, dW_t, \quad \boldsymbol{Y}_T = \boldsymbol{g}^m(X_T), \tag{2.5}$$

admits a Markovian solution $(\boldsymbol{v}^m, \boldsymbol{w}^m)$.

Suppose that there exist sequences $\{M_n\}, \{c_n\}$ in $[0,\infty)$, $\{\alpha_n\}$ in $(0,1]$ and $\{q_n\}$ with $q_n > 1 + d/2$, such that

(1) (C^{α}_{loc}-regularity of the terminal condition) The sequence $\{\boldsymbol{g}^m\}$ is bounded in $C^{\{\alpha_n\}}_{loc}$.

(2) (A-priori continuity and local uniform boundedness) For all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\boldsymbol{v}^m$ is continuous on $[0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and

$$|\boldsymbol{v}^m(t,x)| \le c_n, \quad \text{for all } (t,x) \in [0,T] \times B_n.$$

(3) (Local uniform quadratic growth) For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist functions $\{k^m_n\}$ such that

$$\sup_{m\in\mathbb{N}} ||k^m_n||_{\mathbb{L}^{q_n}([0,T]\times B_n)} < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad |\boldsymbol{f}^m(t,x,\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{z})| \le M_n\Big(|\boldsymbol{z}|^2 + k^m_n(t,x)\Big),$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times B_n$, $|\boldsymbol{y}| \le c_n$, and $\boldsymbol{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times d}$.

(4) (Local Lyapunov pair) There exist functions $\{h_n\}$ such that $(\{h_n\}, \{k^m_n\})$ is a local $\{2c_n\}$-Lyapunov pair for $\boldsymbol{f}^m$ for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, i.e. $(\{h_n\}, \{k^m_n\}) \in \mathbf{Ly}_{loc}(\boldsymbol{f}^m, \{2c_n\})$.

Then, the sequence $\{\boldsymbol{v}^m\}$ is bounded in $C^{\{\alpha'_n\}}_{loc}$, for some $\{\alpha'_n\}$ in $(0,1]$.

Remark 2.6.

(1) The sequence $\{h_n\}$ in condition (4) above is chosen uniformly for all $\{\boldsymbol{f}^m\}$. Therefore the inequality (2.4) is satisfied for all $\boldsymbol{f}^m$ and k^m_n. It is without loss of generality to have $|\boldsymbol{z}|^2$ on the right-hand side of (2.4), since any positive constant δ_n before $|\boldsymbol{z}|^2$ can be normalized to 1 after scaling h_n and k^m_n by $1/\delta_n$.

(2) Applying the uniform estimate in Theorem 2.5 to a constant sequence (i.e. all $\{\boldsymbol{f}^m\}$ and $\{\boldsymbol{g}^m\}$ are the same for different m), we obtain an a priori estimate for a continuous Markovian solution of a single system: let $(\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{w})$ be a continuous Markovian solution to (2.7) whose data $\boldsymbol{f}$ and $\boldsymbol{g}$ satisfy assumptions in Theorem 2.5, then $\boldsymbol{v}$ is locally Hölderian.

2.3. **Existence, uniqueness, and bmo-regularity.** A direct consequence of the uniform estimate in Theorem 2.5 is the existence of a Markovian solution to the system (2.7), whose data $(\boldsymbol{f}, \boldsymbol{g})$ are approximated by a sequence $\{\boldsymbol{f}^m, \boldsymbol{g}^m\}$.

Theorem 2.7. *(Existence by approximation) Let $\boldsymbol{f} : [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^{N\times d} \to \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\boldsymbol{g} : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ be a pair of Borel functions. Assume that there exist sequences $\{\boldsymbol{f}^m\}$ and $\{\boldsymbol{g}^m\}$ which satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 2.5 and*

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \boldsymbol{f}^m(t,x,\boldsymbol{y}^m,\boldsymbol{z}^m) = \boldsymbol{f}(t,x,\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{z}) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{m\to\infty} \boldsymbol{g}^m(x) = \boldsymbol{g}(x), \tag{2.6}$$

for all $(t,x,\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{z}) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^{N\times d}$ and all sequences $\boldsymbol{y}^m \to \boldsymbol{y}$ and $\boldsymbol{z}^m \to \boldsymbol{z}$. Then the system

$$d\boldsymbol{Y}_t = -\boldsymbol{f}(t,X_t,\boldsymbol{Y}_t,\boldsymbol{Z}_t)\,dt + \boldsymbol{Z}_t\sigma(t,X_t)\,dW_t, \quad \boldsymbol{Y}_T = \boldsymbol{g}(X_T), \tag{2.7}$$

admits a locally Hölderian solution $(\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{w})$ such that $\boldsymbol{v}$ is a locally uniform limit of a subsequence of $\{\boldsymbol{v}^m\}$ in Theorem 2.5, and $\boldsymbol{w}$ is the weak Jacobian of $\boldsymbol{v}$ on $(0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d$.

The solutions produced in Theorem 2.7 are not necessarily unique, even when the solutions to the approximating equations are. Moreover, their local-martingale parts are not necessarily (true) martingales. Indeed, one only needs to consider the case where $\boldsymbol{f} \equiv 0$ and where $\{\boldsymbol{g}^m\}$ is a sequence of bounded and smooth approximations to the function $\boldsymbol{g}$ appearing in Tychonov's non-uniqueness theorem (see [Joh78, p. 171]) for the heat equation.

As we shall see below, these pathologies disappear under appropriate conditions on $\boldsymbol{f}$ and $\boldsymbol{g}$. For example, when there exist a Lyapunov pair (h,k) with bounded k, martingality (bmo-martingality, in fact) is obtained for bounded solutions. When the generator does not depend on $\boldsymbol{y}$ and satisfies additional regularity assumption in $\boldsymbol{z}$, uniqueness is also recovered. Two Markovian solutions, $(\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{w})$ and $(\boldsymbol{v}',\boldsymbol{w}')$, are considered equal if $\boldsymbol{v}(t,x) = \boldsymbol{v}'(t,x)$ for all $(t,x) \in [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d$ and $\boldsymbol{w} = \boldsymbol{w}'$, a.e., with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d$.

Theorem 2.8 (Uniqueness and bmo-regularity)**.** *Given a constant $c > 0$, suppose that there exists a (global) Lyapunov pair $(h,k) \in \mathbf{Ly}(\boldsymbol{f},c)$ with k bounded. Furthermore, suppose that there exist a sequence $\{\alpha_n\}$ in $(0,1]$ and a constant $M > 0$ such that*

$$\boldsymbol{g} \in C^{\{\alpha_n\}}_{loc} \cap \mathbb{L}^\infty \quad \text{and} \quad |\boldsymbol{f}(t,x,\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{z})| \le M\Big(1 + |\boldsymbol{z}|^2\Big),$$

for all $(t,x) \in [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d$, $|\boldsymbol{y}| \le c$, and $\boldsymbol{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times d}$. Then

(1) each continuous solution $(\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{w})$ of (2.2) with $||\boldsymbol{v}||_{\mathbb{L}^\infty} \le c$ is a bmo-solution, and

(2) if, additionally, $\boldsymbol{f}$ is continuous, does not depend on $\boldsymbol{y}$, and there exists $\tilde{M} \ge 0$ such that

$$|\boldsymbol{f}(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}) - \boldsymbol{f}(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}')| \le \tilde{M}(|\boldsymbol{z}| + |\boldsymbol{z}'|)\,|\boldsymbol{z} - \boldsymbol{z}'|\,, \quad \text{for all } t,x,\boldsymbol{z},\boldsymbol{z}',$$

then (2.2) admits at most one continuous solution $(\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{w})$ with $||\boldsymbol{v}||_{\mathbb{L}^\infty} \le c$.

2.4. **A sufficient condition for existence and uniqueness.** As we will see in Section 3, the generator $\boldsymbol{f}$ is independent of $\boldsymbol{y}$ in many applications. In this case, the following result provides explicit conditions on the generator $\boldsymbol{f}$ and the terminal condition $\boldsymbol{g}$ such that assumptions in Theorems 2.5, 2.7, and 2.8 hold for the following system

$$d\boldsymbol{Y}_t = -\boldsymbol{f}(t,X_t,\boldsymbol{Z}_t)\,dt + \boldsymbol{Z}_t\sigma(t,X_t)\,dW_t, \quad \boldsymbol{Y}_T = \boldsymbol{g}(X_T). \tag{2.8}$$

While the proof depends on the abstract Theorem 2.5 above, we state it in a self-contained form to make it more accessible to a reader interested in its applications.

We start with a structural condition on the generator $\boldsymbol{f}$. To the best of our knowledge, a version of it was first formulated in [BF02b]. We present here a generalization including a subquadratic term; a further generalization will be discussed in Remark 2.14 below. We interpret $\boldsymbol{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times d}$ as an $N \times d$-matrix, and use $\boldsymbol{z}^j$ to denote its j-th row, $j = 1, \dots, N$. In the vector case the superscript j denotes the j-th component.

Definition 2.9 (The Bensoussan-Frehse (BF) condition)**.** We say that a continuous function $\boldsymbol{f} : [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{N\times d} \to \mathbb{R}^N$ satisfies the **condition (BF)** if it admits a decomposition of the form

$$\boldsymbol{f}(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}) = \operatorname{diag}(\boldsymbol{z}\,\mathsf{l}(t,x,\boldsymbol{z})) + \mathsf{q}(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}) + \mathsf{s}(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}) + \mathsf{k}(t,x), \tag{2.9}$$

such that the functions $\mathsf{l} : [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{N\times d} \to \mathbb{R}^{d\times N}$ and $\mathsf{q}, \mathsf{s}, \mathsf{k} : [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{N\times d} \to \mathbb{R}^N$ have following property: there exist two sequences $\{C_n\}$ and $\{q_n\}$ of positive constants with $q_n > 1+d/2$, and a sequence $\{\kappa_n\}$ of functions $\kappa_n : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ with $\lim_{w\to\infty} \kappa_n(w)/w^2 = 0$ such that, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}) \in [0,T] \times B_n \times \mathbb{R}^{N\times d}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\mathsf{l}(t,x,\boldsymbol{z})| \le C_n(1+|\boldsymbol{z}|), && \text{(quadratic-linear)}\\
&\left|\mathsf{q}^i(t,x,\boldsymbol{z})\right| \le C_n\Big(1+\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^i |\boldsymbol{z}^j|^2\Big), \quad i=1,\dots,N, && \text{(quadratic-triangular)}\\
&|\mathsf{s}(t,x,\boldsymbol{z})| \le \kappa_n(|\boldsymbol{z}|), && \text{(subquadratic)}\\
&\mathsf{k} \in \mathbb{L}^{q_n}([0,T]\times B_n), && (\boldsymbol{z}\text{-independent})
\end{aligned}$$

In that case, we write $\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbf{BF}(\{C_n\},\{\kappa_n\},\{q_n\})$

The (BF) conditions are simple enough to be easily checked in applications, but also strong enough to yield the following result which will play a major role in the existence theorem below:

Proposition 2.10 (Existence of Lyapunov pairs under condition (BF))**.** *Let $\{c_n\}$ is an arbitrary sequence of positive constants, and $\boldsymbol{f}$ a function in $\mathbf{BF}(\{C_n\},\{\kappa_n\},\{q_n\})$.*

(1) There exists a local $\{c_n\}$-Lyapunov pair $(\{h_n\},\{k_n\})$ for $\boldsymbol{f}$. Furthermore, the same pair $(\{h_n\},\{k_n\})$ is a local $\{c_n\}$-Lyapunov pair for any other function $\boldsymbol{f}' \in \mathbf{BF}(\{C_n\},\{\kappa_n\},\{q_n\})$.

(2) If, additionally, the sequences $\{C_n\}$, $\{q_n\}$ and $\{\kappa_n\}$ are constant (in n), then, for each c, a (global) c-Lyapunov pair for $\boldsymbol{f}$ exists.

Another ingredient necessary to guarantee the existence of a solution to (2.8) is a-priori boundedness. We remind the reader that a set of non-zero vectors $\boldsymbol{a}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{a}_K$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$ (with $K > N$) is said to **positively span** $\mathbb{R}^N$, if, for each $\boldsymbol{a} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ there exist nonnegative constants $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_K$ such that

$$\lambda_1\boldsymbol{a}_1 + \cdots + \lambda_K\boldsymbol{a}_K = \boldsymbol{a}.$$

The following two well-known characterization (see [Dav54]), presented here for reader's convenience, make positively-spanning sets easy to spot: (1) Non-zero vectors $\boldsymbol{a}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{a}_K$ positively span $\mathbb{R}^N$ if for every $\boldsymbol{a} \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ there exists $k \in \{1,\dots,K\}$ such that $\boldsymbol{a}^\top\boldsymbol{a}_k > 0$. (2) If non-zero vectors $\boldsymbol{a}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{a}_K$ already span $\mathbb{R}^N$, then they positively span $\mathbb{R}^N$ if $\mathbf{0}$ admits a nontrivial positive representation, i.e., if there exist nonnegative $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_K$, not all 0, such that $\lambda_1\boldsymbol{a}_1 + \cdots + \lambda_K\boldsymbol{a}_K = 0$.

Definition 2.11 (The a-priori boundedness (AB) condition)**.** We say that $\boldsymbol{f}$ satisfies the **condition (AB)** if there exist a deterministic function $l \in \mathbb{L}^1[0,T]$, and a set $\boldsymbol{a}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{a}_K$ which positively spans $\mathbb{R}^N$, such that

$$\boldsymbol{a}_k^\top \boldsymbol{f}(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}) \le l(t) + \tfrac{1}{2}|\boldsymbol{a}_k^\top \boldsymbol{z}|^2, \qquad \text{for all } (t,x,\boldsymbol{z}) \text{ and } k = 1,\dots,K. \tag{2.10}$$

We say that $\boldsymbol{f}$ satisfies the **weak condition (AB)** - abbreviated as **(wAB)** - if there exist Borel functions $\boldsymbol{L}_k : [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{N\times d} \to \mathbb{R}^d$, for $k = 1,\dots,K$, such that $|\boldsymbol{L}_k(t,x,\boldsymbol{z})| \le C(1+|\boldsymbol{z}|)$ for some constant C and

$$\boldsymbol{a}_k^\top \boldsymbol{f}(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}) \le l(t) + \tfrac{1}{2}|\boldsymbol{a}_k^\top \boldsymbol{z}|^2 + \boldsymbol{a}_k^\top \boldsymbol{z}\boldsymbol{L}_k(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}), \qquad \text{for all } (t,x,\boldsymbol{z}) \text{ and } k = 1,\dots,K. \tag{2.11}$$

Remark 2.12. The constant $\frac{1}{2}$ in (2.10) is simply a convenient choice for later use; it can easily be replaced by any other constant by scaling. Furthermore, conditions (AB) and (wAB) are invariant under invertible linear transformation of $\mathbb{R}^N$. More precisely, suppose that $\boldsymbol{f}$ satisfies (wAB) with $l \in \mathbb{L}^1[0,T]$, the positively-spanning set $\boldsymbol{a}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{a}_K$ and the functions $\{\boldsymbol{L}_k\}$, and that $\Sigma : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}^N$ is an invertible linear map. Then the generator of the transformed system, namely $\tilde{\boldsymbol{f}}(t,x,\tilde{\boldsymbol{z}}) := \Sigma \boldsymbol{f}(t,x,\boldsymbol{z})$, satisfies (wAB) with the same l, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{L}}_k(t,x,\tilde{\boldsymbol{z}}) = \boldsymbol{L}_k(t,x,\boldsymbol{z})$, and transformed (but still positively spanning) set $(\Sigma^{-1})^\top \boldsymbol{a}_k$, $k = 1,\dots,K$.

Theorem 2.13 (Existence and uniqueness under (BF)+(AB))**.** *Suppose that $\boldsymbol{f}$ satisfies conditions (BF) and (AB), and that $\boldsymbol{g} \in C_{loc}^{\{\alpha_n\}}$ satisfies $\lim_{|x|\to\infty} |\boldsymbol{g}(x)| / |x|^2 = 0$. Then the system (2.8) admits a locally Hölderian solution $(\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{w})$. When $\boldsymbol{g}$ is bounded, the condition (AB) can be replaced by (wAB) and $(\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{w})$ is a bounded bmo-solution.*

This solution $(\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{w})$ is unique in the class of bounded continuous solutions if the following, additional, assumptions are met:

- *(a) the functions $\boldsymbol{f}(\cdot,\cdot,0)$ and $\boldsymbol{g}$ are bounded,*
- *(b) the constants $\{C_n\}$ and functions $\{\kappa_n\}$ in the (BF) condition do not depend on n, and*
- *(c) there exists a constant M such that $|\boldsymbol{f}(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}) - \boldsymbol{f}(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}')| \le M(|\boldsymbol{z}| + |\boldsymbol{z}'|)\,|\boldsymbol{z} - \boldsymbol{z}'|$ for all $t \in [0,T]$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{z}' \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times d}$.*

Remark 2.14. Here are two extensions of Theorem 2.13 which, for the sake of simplicity of presentation, we did not put into its statement. They will be proved, however, along with Theorem 2.13, below.

(1) When $\boldsymbol{g}$ is bounded, the conclusions of Theorem 2.13 hold if the equality in (2.9) holds only approximately, namely if, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a sufficiently small ε_n such that

$$\left|\boldsymbol{f}(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}) - \operatorname{diag}(\boldsymbol{z}\mathbf{l}(t,x,\boldsymbol{z})) - \mathbf{q}(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}) - \mathbf{s}(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}) - \mathbf{k}(t,x)\right| \le \varepsilon_n\,|\boldsymbol{z}|^2 \tag{2.12}$$

holds on $[0,T] \times B_n \times \mathbb{R}^{N\times d}$. How small this ε_n needs to be depends on the constants $\{C_n\}$ in the condition (BF), on $||\boldsymbol{v}||_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}$ (which, in turn, depends on $||\boldsymbol{g}||_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}$ and the functions and constants appearing in condition (wAB)), as well as the universal constants (Λ, T, d, N, etc.). In general, it is possible to obtain an explicit expression for an estimate of ε_n by keeping track of the explicit values of the constants involved in the proof, but we do not pursue that here. The case in which such an explicit expression may prove to be useful is when $\mathbf{l} = \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{0}$, i.e. when $\boldsymbol{f}$ is of general structure, but satisfies

a smallness assumption. This case allows for an especially simple treatment; indeed, to construct a global Lyapunov pair, it suffices to pick

$$h(\boldsymbol{y}) = \tfrac{1}{2}\left|\boldsymbol{y}\right|^2, k \equiv 0, \text{ so that } D^2h = I_d \text{ and } Dh(\boldsymbol{y}) = \boldsymbol{y}.$$

Then,

$$\tfrac{1}{2}D^2h : \langle \boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{z}\rangle_a = \tfrac{1}{2}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^D \left|\boldsymbol{z}^i\sigma\right|^2 \geq \tfrac{1}{2}\Lambda^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^D \left|\boldsymbol{z}^i\right|^2, \quad \text{but} \quad Dh\boldsymbol{f} \leq \varepsilon\left|\boldsymbol{y}\right|\left|\boldsymbol{z}\right|^2.$$

Therefore, it suffices to require $\varepsilon < (4\Lambda||\boldsymbol{v}||_{\mathbb{L}^\infty})^{-1}$ so that $(h, 0) \in \mathbf{Ly}(\boldsymbol{f}, 2\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty})$. This recovers the situation in [Str81] where solutions to parabolic systems of PDEs were constructed under a parallel "smallness" condition.

(2) Suppose that some component of $\boldsymbol{g}(X_T)$, say the j-th, has a bounded Malliavin derivative and $\boldsymbol{f}^j$ does not depend on $\boldsymbol{z}^i$ for $i \neq j$. It is known then (see [BE13] and [CN14] for sufficient conditions on X, f^j and g^j) that the j-th component $\boldsymbol{Z}^j$ of the solution is bounded, too. In this case, Theorem 2.13 still holds if any locally bounded function of $\boldsymbol{z}^j$ is added to the right-hand side of (2.10) and (2.11).

3. Examples

We illustrate the strength of our results by considering four different classes of BSDE systems arising from game theory, geometry, mathematical economics and mathematical finance. Proofs of all statements are postponed until section 5.

3.1. **Incomplete stochastic equilibria.** The existence and properties of equilibrium (market-clearing) asset-price dynamics in financial markets is one of the central problems in financial economics and mathematical finance. While the so-called complete market case has been fully understood, the incomplete market case has been open since early 1990s. A stochastic equilibrium among N heterogeneous agents in incomplete markets has been considered in [KXŽ15]. There the filtration is generated by a 2-dimensional Brownian motion $W = (B, B^\perp)$, where the first component drives the price of a tradable asset but both components can determine the size of agents' random endowment. Preference of agents are modeled by exponential utilities with heterogenous risk-tolerance coefficients. An equilibrium is a pair consisting of an asset-price process and agents' trading strategies such that every agent maximizes the expected utility from trading and random endowment, meanwhile supply equals to demand (market clears), cf. [KXŽ15, Definition 1.1].

In this setting, [KXŽ15] considered the following system of quadratic BSDE:

$$d\boldsymbol{Y}_t = \boldsymbol{\mu}_t dB_t + \boldsymbol{\nu}_t dB_t^\perp + \left(\tfrac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\nu}_t^2 - \tfrac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{A}[\boldsymbol{\mu}_t]^2 + \boldsymbol{A}[\boldsymbol{\mu}_t]\boldsymbol{\mu}_t\right)dt, \quad \boldsymbol{Y}_T = \boldsymbol{G}, \tag{3.1}$$

where $\boldsymbol{A}[\boldsymbol{\mu}] = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha^i\mu^i$ for a sequence of constants (α^i) with $\alpha^i \in (0, 1)$ and $\sum_{i=1}^N \alpha^i = 1$. It is proved in [KXŽ15, Theorem 1.6] that equilibria one-to-one correspond to solutions of (3.1) with $(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\nu}) \in$ bmo. Moreover in an equilibrium, each component of $\boldsymbol{Y}$ represents the certainty equivalence of each agent. However, when it comes to the existence and uniqueness of solutions, certain "smallness-type" of conditions need to be assumed; either $||\boldsymbol{G}||_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}$ is sufficiently small or T is sufficiently small, cf. [KXŽ15, Corollaries 2.6 and 2.7]. In the Markovian setting, existence of solutions was also established for sufficiently small T in [Žit12] in a similar model, and [Zha12] and [CL15, Theorem 3.1].

The following result establishes global existence and uniqueness of equilibrium in a Markovian setting with bounded random endowment. Here, X is the solution of (2.1) with $W = (B, B^{\perp})$, $b : [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$, and $\sigma : [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^{d\times 2}$ satisfying conditions (1)-(3) after (2.1).

Theorem 3.1 (Existence and uniqueness of incomplete stochastic equilibria)**.** *Suppose that the terminal condition is of the form $\boldsymbol{G} = \boldsymbol{g}(X_T)$ for some $\boldsymbol{g} \in C^{\{\alpha_n\}}_{loc} \cap \mathbb{L}^{\infty}$. Then the system (3.1) admits a unique bounded continuous solution. Consequently, an incomplete stochastic equilibrium in the setting of* [KXŽ15] *exists and is unique in the class of equilibria in which each agent's certainty-equivalence process is a continuous function of time and the state X.*

Remark 3.2. When $\boldsymbol{g}$ is of merely subquadratic growth, the system (3.1) still admits a locally Hölderian solution, but the martingale part associated to this solution may not have enough integrability to be identified with an equilibrium.

3.2. **Martingales on manifolds.** It is well-known that semimartingales can be defined on arbitrary differentiable manifolds, but that martingales require additional structure, namely that of a connection (if one wants a Brownian motion, one needs a full Riemannian metric). We refer the reader to the books [Éme89] and [Hsu02] for more details.

In the flat (Euclidean) case, martingales are easily constructed from their terminal values by a simple process of filtering, i.e., computing conditional expectation. When the underlying filtration is Brownian, one can, additionally, build this martingale from the given Brownian motion via the martingale representation theorem; this amounts to a solution to a linear system of BSDE.

If the geometry is not flat, one cannot simply filter anymore, but, as it turns out, the problem can still be formulated in terms of a system of BSDE. This system, however, is no longer linear and the existence of its solution has been a subject of extensive study (see, e.g., [Dar95], [Bla05] and [Bla06]).

Before we write down this system, we set the stage by assuming that a d-dimensional Brownian motion W is given, and that the target space is an N-dimensional differentiable manifold M, without boundary, endowed with an affine connection. This connection, Γ, is described in coordinates by its Christoffel symbols Γ^k_{ij}; we assume these are all Lipschitz on compact sets, but not necessarily differentiable (as we will not be needing the concept of curvature).

The martingale property on a manifold with a connection Γ can be formulated in many ways - we prefer to give the one that resembles a characterization in the flat case; we say that a continuous M-valued semimartingale $\boldsymbol{Y}$ is a Γ-**martingale** (with respect to the natural filtration of W) if

$$f(\boldsymbol{Y}_t) - \tfrac{1}{2}\int_0^t \operatorname{Hess} f(d\boldsymbol{Y}_t, d\boldsymbol{Y}_t), t \in [0,T],$$

is a local martingale for each smooth real-valued f. Here $\operatorname{Hess} f$ is the (covariant) Hessian of f, i.e., a $(0,2)$-tensor, given in our coordinate chart by

$$(\operatorname{Hess} f)_{ij}(\boldsymbol{y}) = D_{ij} f(\boldsymbol{y}) - \Gamma^k_{ij}(\boldsymbol{y}) D_k f(\boldsymbol{y}).$$

We refer the reader to [Éme89, p. 23] for the definition of quadratic variation with respect to a $(0,2)$-tensor field (such as Hess) on a manifold. Itô's formula immediately implies that $\boldsymbol{Y}$ is a Γ-martingale if its coordinate representation admits the following semimartingale decomposition

$$dY^k_t = -\tfrac{1}{2}\textstyle\sum_{i,j=1}^d \Gamma^k_{ij}(\boldsymbol{Y}_t)(\boldsymbol{Z}^i_t)^{\top} \boldsymbol{Z}^j_t \, dt + \boldsymbol{Z}^k_t \, dW_t, \ k = 1, \dots, N, \tag{3.2}$$

where, as usual, $\boldsymbol{Z}^j$ denotes the j-th row of the $N \times d$-matrix-valued process $\boldsymbol{Z}$.

For simplicity, and without too great a loss of generality, we assume that the given terminal value $\boldsymbol{G}$ of the martingale we want to construct is of the form $\boldsymbol{g}(W_T)$. Furthermore, we assume that the image of $\boldsymbol{g}$ is localized in the following way: there exists a convex and compact set M_0, covered by the image $V \subseteq M$ of a single chart, with coordinates $\boldsymbol{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_N)$, such that $\boldsymbol{g}(x) \in M_0$, for all $x \in R^d$. This way, we can work in a single coordinate chart, as if M itself were an open set of $\mathbb{R}^N$ and, in fact, assume that $M = \mathbb{R}^N$. Also since we only care about the connection in a neighborhood of M_0, we assume that the Christoffel symbols are globally Lipschitz.

As in [Dar95], we make the following assumption on the geometry of M around the image of $\boldsymbol{g}$:

Assumption 3.3 (Double convexity)**.** There exists a convex function $\phi \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that

(1) $M_0 = \phi^{-1}((-\infty, 0])$, and
(2) $\operatorname{Hess} \phi$ is nonnegative definite (ϕ is geodesically convex), and strictly positive definite on some neigborhood of M_0.

Applying Theorem 2.7 to the current setting, we obtain the following result.

Proposition 3.4. *If $\boldsymbol{g} \in C^{\{\alpha_n\}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and Assumption 3.3 holds, there exists a Γ-martingale $\{\boldsymbol{Y}_t\}_{t\in[0,T]}$ with $\boldsymbol{Y}_T = \boldsymbol{g}(W_T)$ which takes values in M_0, for all $t \in [0, T]$.*

Remark 3.5.

(1) While the detailed proof of Proposition 3.4 above is postponed until Section 5, we comment, briefly, on the interpretation of Lyapunov pairs in this, special, case. What makes it especially convenient is the fact that the driver $\boldsymbol{f}$ depends on $\boldsymbol{Z}$ only through the symmetric matrix $\boldsymbol{Z}^\top \boldsymbol{Z}$. A simple computation shows that $(h, 0)$ is a c-Lyapunov pair if (and only if) the matrix
$$\left(D^2_{ij} h(\boldsymbol{y}) - \textstyle\sum_k D_k h(\boldsymbol{y})\, \Gamma^k_{ij}(\boldsymbol{y})\right)_{ij},\ i, j = 1, \dots, d$$
is strictly positive definite for all $|\boldsymbol{y}| \le c$. Equivalently, $\operatorname{Hess} h(\boldsymbol{y}) \succeq 0$, i.e., h is (geodesically) strictly convex (see, e.g., Chapter 3 of [Udr94] for a detailed discussion of convexity on Riemannian manifolds). This characterization fits perfectly with our interpretation of Lyapunov functions as "submartingale" functions.
(2) Unlike in the flat case, where convex functions abound, the very existence of (geodesically) convex functions depends on geometric properties on M. We do not go into details, but note that smooth nontrivial global convex functions always exist on complete, simple-connected Riemanninan manifolds of nonpositive sectional curvature (Cartan-Hadamard manifolds); cf. [Ken90]. In the general case, one can always find a convex function locally, but it is not hard to see that compact Riemannian manifolds, e.g., never admit nonconstant global convex functions. We refer the reader to [Udr94] for a thorough treatment of geodesic convexity.
(3) The condition of double convexity has been imposed in [Dar95] to construct not-necessarily-Markovian martingales with values in manifolds with connections. Our construction not only recovers some of the results from [Dar95] in the Markovian case, but also gives a partial positive answer to Conjecture 7.2., p. 1257. Indeed, Proposition 3.4 does not require

M_0 to have *doubly convex geometry*, i.e., does not assume conditions 5.1 and 6.1 in [Dar95, Theorem 7.1].

(4) Without too much work, Proposition 3.4 can be extended in several directions. First, the flat Brownian motion W can be replaced by a Brownian motion on a Riemannian manifold (with metric g); indeed, one simply needs to solve a modified version of BSDE 3.2 driven by a driftless diffusion whose dispersion coefficient σ relates to the underlying metric as $\sigma\sigma^\top = g^{-1}$. Moreover, under appropriate growth conditions, the linear connection Γ can be replaced by a nonlinear one, of the form $\Gamma = \Gamma(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{Z}^\top \boldsymbol{Z})$.

(5) Seen as a map between manifolds, a function which transforms a Browninan motion into a martingale is called harmonic. Our BSDE (3.2) corresponds to the parabolic system introduced by [ES64] in order to show that, under certain geometric conditions, harmonic maps exist within each homotopy class (see [Aub98, Chapter 10] for a detailed treatment of this fascinating problem).

3.3. **A Stochastic Game with Cooperation or Hinderance.** Our next example concerns a finite-horizon stochastic differential game which is inspired by a bounded-domain discounted game treated in [BF00]. For simplicity of presentation, we assume there are only 2 players whom we call Player 1 and Player 2. On a d-dimensional Brownian filtration, these players choose two $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued processes, namely $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ in bmo, as their respective controls. These affect the state X through its drift in the following way:

$$dX_t^{(\mu,\nu)} = \Big(b(X_t^{(\mu,\nu)}) + \boldsymbol{\mu}_t + \boldsymbol{\nu}_t\Big)dt + dW_t^{(\mu,\nu)}, \quad X_0^{(\mu,\nu)} = x,$$

where $b : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is a bounded Lipschitz vector field, and $W^{(\mu,\nu)} = W - \int_0^\cdot (\boldsymbol{\mu}_u + \boldsymbol{\nu}_u)du$ is a Brownian motion under the probability measure $\mathbb{P}^{(\mu,\nu)}$ defined via $d\,\mathbb{P}^{(\mu,\nu)}/d\,\mathbb{P} = (\int(\boldsymbol{\mu}_u + \boldsymbol{\nu}_u)^\top dW_u)_T$. Given a constant θ - which we term the **cooperation penalty** - and integrable-enough functions $h^i, g^i : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, 2$, the cost of player i with the initial state x at time $t = 0$ is defined as

$$J^i(0, x, \mu, \nu) = \mathbb{E}^{(x,\mu,\nu)}\Big[\int_0^T \Big(h^i(X_u) + \tfrac{1}{2}|\boldsymbol{\mu}_u|^2 + \theta\boldsymbol{\mu}_u^\top\boldsymbol{\nu}_u\Big)dt + g^i(X_T)\Big], \quad i = 1, 2,$$

where the expectation is taken with respect to $\mathbb{P}^{(x,\mu,\nu)}$. It is clear from its form how large positive values of the parameter θ incentivize the players to push in opposing directions, while the large negative values motivate them to cooperate. A **Nash equilibrium** between these two players is a pair $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}})$ of controls with the property that, for any $\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\nu} \in$ bmo, we have

$$J^1(0, x, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) \le J^1(0, x, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) \quad \text{and} \quad J^2(0, x, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) \le J^2(0, x, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \boldsymbol{\nu}), \tag{3.3}$$

and $(J^1, J^2)(\cdot, \cdot, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}})$ is called the value of this equilibrium.

We recast the problem as a BSDE system by introducing the Lagrangians of the two players:

$$L^1(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\nu}, \boldsymbol{p}) = \tfrac{1}{2}|\boldsymbol{\mu}|^2 + \theta\boldsymbol{\mu}\cdot\boldsymbol{\nu} + \boldsymbol{p}^1(\boldsymbol{\mu} + \boldsymbol{\nu}) \quad \text{and} \quad L^2(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\nu}, \boldsymbol{p}) = \tfrac{1}{2}|\boldsymbol{\nu}|^2 + \theta\boldsymbol{\mu}\cdot\boldsymbol{\nu} + \boldsymbol{p}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu} + \boldsymbol{\nu}),$$

where $\boldsymbol{p}^i$ is i-th row vector of $\boldsymbol{p}$. When $\theta \neq \pm 1$, the minimizers are given by

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\boldsymbol{p}) = \tfrac{\theta}{(1+\theta)(1-\theta)}(\boldsymbol{p}^1 + \boldsymbol{p}^2) - \tfrac{1}{1-\theta}\boldsymbol{p}^1 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(\boldsymbol{p}) = \tfrac{\theta}{(1+\theta)(1-\theta)}(\boldsymbol{p}^1 + \boldsymbol{p}^2) - \tfrac{1}{1-\theta}\boldsymbol{p}^2. \tag{3.4}$$

Setting $L^i(\boldsymbol{p}) = L^i(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\boldsymbol{p}), \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(\boldsymbol{p}), \boldsymbol{p})$ and $\boldsymbol{L} = (L^1, L^2)^\top$, we pose the following BSDE:

$$d\boldsymbol{Y}_t = -\boldsymbol{f}(X_t, \boldsymbol{Z}_t)dt + \boldsymbol{Z}_t dW_t, \quad \boldsymbol{Y}_T = \boldsymbol{g}(X_T), \text{ where } \boldsymbol{f}(x, \boldsymbol{z}) = \boldsymbol{h}(x) + \boldsymbol{L}(\boldsymbol{z}), \tag{3.5}$$

with the state process given by $dX_t = b(X_t)dt + dW_t$ on the (augmented) filtration generated by W. The following result establishes a unique bounded Hölderian solution, which corresponds to a Nash equilibrium.

Proposition 3.6. *Assume that $\boldsymbol{h} \in \mathbb{L}^\infty$ and $\boldsymbol{g} \in C_{loc}^{\{\alpha_n\}} \cap \mathbb{L}^\infty$. When $-1 \neq \theta \leq 1/2$ or $\theta > 1$, the equation (3.5) admits a unique bounded continuous solution $(\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{w})$. Moreover the pair $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\boldsymbol{Z}), \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(\boldsymbol{Z}))$, where $\boldsymbol{Z} = \boldsymbol{w}(\cdot, X)$, is in bmo and enacts a Nash equilibrium with the value $\boldsymbol{v}$.*

3.4. **Risk-sensitive nonzero-sum stochastic games.** Next, we consider a risk-sensitive stochastic game between 2 players studied in [EKH03]. Let U and V be two compact metric spaces. Player 1 (resp. player 2) chooses a U-valued (resp. V-valued) control process $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{\nu}$), which affects the state X in the following way:

$$dX_t^{(\mu,\nu)} = b(t, X_t^{(\mu,\nu)}, \boldsymbol{\mu}_t, \boldsymbol{\nu}_t)\, dt + \sigma(t, X_t^{\mu,\nu})\, dW_t^{(\mu,\nu)},$$

where $b : [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U \times V \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is a bounded measurable vector field, σ satisfies conditions (2) and (3) after (2.1), and X is understood as the unique weak solution of the previous stochastic differential equation. Given measurable functions $h^i : [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U \times V \to \mathbb{R}$ and $g^i : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ with enough integrability, the cost of player i with the initial state x at time $t = 0$ is defined as

$$J^i(0, x, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\nu}) = \mathbb{E}^{(x,\mu,\nu)}\bigg[\exp\bigg(\int_0^T h^i(u, X_u, \boldsymbol{\mu}_u, \boldsymbol{\nu}_u)\, du + g^i(X_T)\bigg)\bigg], \quad i = 1, 2.$$

The problem is to find a Nash equilibrium $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}})$ satisfying (3.3). To solve it, we define the Hamiltonian function

$$\begin{aligned} H^1(t, x, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\nu}) &= \boldsymbol{\mu}\sigma^{-1}(t, x)b(t, x, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\nu}) + h^1(t, x, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\nu}) \quad \text{and} \\ H^2(t, x, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\nu}) &= \boldsymbol{\nu}\sigma^{-1}(t, x)b(t, x, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\nu}) + h^2(t, x, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\nu}), \end{aligned}$$

and assume the *generalized Issac's condition* holds, i.e., there exists two measurable functions $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(t, x, \boldsymbol{z})$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(t, x, \boldsymbol{z})$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} H^1(t, x, \boldsymbol{z}^1, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(t, x, \boldsymbol{z}), \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(t, x, \boldsymbol{z})) &\leq H^1(t, x, \boldsymbol{z}^1, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(t, x, \boldsymbol{z})) \quad \text{and} \\ H^2(t, x, \boldsymbol{z}^2, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(t, x, \boldsymbol{z}), \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(t, x, \boldsymbol{z})) &\leq H^2(t, x, \boldsymbol{z}^2, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(t, x, \boldsymbol{z}), \boldsymbol{\nu}), \end{aligned}$$

for any $(t, x, \boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\nu}) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{2\times d} \times U \times V$. Denote $\hat{H}^1(t, x, \boldsymbol{z}) = H^1(t, x, \boldsymbol{z}^1, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(t, x, \boldsymbol{z}), \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(t, x, \boldsymbol{z}))$ and $\hat{H}^2(t, x, \boldsymbol{z}) = H^2(t, x, \boldsymbol{z}^2, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(t, x, \boldsymbol{z}), \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(t, x, \boldsymbol{z}))$. We consider the following system of BSDE:

$$dY_t^i = -\Big(\hat{H}^i(t, X_t, \boldsymbol{Z}_t) + \tfrac{1}{2}|\boldsymbol{Z}_t^i|^2\Big)\, dt + \boldsymbol{Z}_t^i dW_t, \quad Y_T^i = g^i(X_T),\ i = 1, 2. \tag{3.6}$$

Proposition 3.7. *Assume that $g^i \in C_{loc}^{\{\alpha_n\}} \cap \mathbb{L}^\infty$, $h^i \in \mathbb{L}^\infty$, and $\hat{H}^i$ is continuous, for $i = 1, 2$. Moreover b has at most linear growth in $(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\nu})$, and $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}})$ has at most linear growth in $\boldsymbol{z}$, both uniformly in (t, x). Then (3.6) admits a unique bounded continuous solution $(\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{w})$. Moreover $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\cdot, \cdot, \boldsymbol{w}), \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(\cdot, \cdot, \boldsymbol{w}))$ is a Nash equilibrium with value $(\exp(v^1), \exp(v^2))$.*

Remark 3.8. A solution to (3.6) was constructed in [EKH03, Theorem 5.3] in the case of a bounded b and a bounded (but not necessarily continuous) terminal condition $\boldsymbol{g}$. When $\boldsymbol{g}$ is locally Hölder, our result shows that the solution is also locally Hölder (cf. Remark 2.6 part (2)). Moreover when $\boldsymbol{g}$ is of merely subquadratic and b is bounded, our result still ensures the existence of locally Hölderian solution to (3.6).

The system (3.6) belongs to the *diagonally quadratic* class studied recently in [HT15], whose Theorem 2.7 implies the existence of a unique bounded solution of (3.6) with non-Markovian bounded terminal condition.

3.5. **A scalar example with unbounded coefficients.** Given continuous functions $f, g : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$, with $g \in C_{loc}^{\{\alpha_n\}} \cap \mathbb{L}^\infty$, but f possibly unbounded, we consider the BSDE

$$dY_t = -\tfrac{1}{2} f(X_t)|Z_t|^2 dt + Z_t\, dW_t, \quad Y_T = g(X_T). \tag{3.7}$$

An equation of this type played a central role in a recent solution [CD15] of a long-standing open problem of [Sub91]. Since the "coefficient" f in front of the quadratic nonlinearity is unbounded, the generator of (3.7) does not satisfy the standard quadratic growth bound in $\boldsymbol{z}$ (as presented, e.g., in [Kob00]).

Our Theorem 2.7 implies that (3.7) admits a bounded locally Hölderian solution. Indeed, consider a sequence $\{f^m\}$ of bounded Lipschitz approximations of f such that $\lim_{m\to\infty} f^m(x) = f(x)$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and the approximating BSDE

$$dY_t^m = -\tfrac{1}{2} f^m(X_t)(|Z_t^m|^2 \wedge m)dt + Z_t^m\, dW_t, \quad Y_T^m = g(X_T), m \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{3.8}$$

Standard Lipshitz theory implies that (3.8) admits a unique bounded continuous solution (v^m, w^m). Moreover, the generator of (3.8) satisfies the condition (BF) of Definition 2.9 with $\mathbf{l}^m = \mathbf{s}^m = \mathbf{k}^m = 0$; the component $\mathbf{q}^m$ satisfies the quadratic-triangular growth condition on each B_n uniformly in m. By Proposition 2.10 above, $\boldsymbol{f}$ admits a local $\{c_n\}$-Lyapunov sequence, for each $\{c_n\}$. To establish a-priori boundedness, we rewrite (3.8) as

$$dY_t^m = Z_t^m\Big[-\tfrac{1}{2} f^m(X_t)\tfrac{|Z_t^m|^2\wedge m}{|Z^m|^2}(Z_t^m)^\top dt + dW_t\Big], \quad Y_T^m = g(X_T).$$

Since f^m and g are bounded, a simple measure-change argument implies that $\|v^m\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty} \le \|g\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}$. Therefore it is enough to pick a local $(||g||_{\mathbb{L}^\infty})$-Lyapunov pair to establish the existence of a bounded locally Hölderian solution by Theorem 2.7. It is worth noting that our uniqueness results do not apply in this case. In fact, as far as we know, no general-purpose uniqueness result is known for BSDE of this type.

Remark 3.9. The techniques of the present paper, geared towards systems of equations, have limited impact in the one-dimensional case where powerful methods based on comparison principle apply. To illustrate that point, we note that the existence of a Markovian solution for (3.7) can also be established using a localization technique of [BH06] or from a forward point of view, as in [BEK13], as follows. With $f^{m,p}(x) = (-p) \vee f(x) \wedge m$ for $m, p \in \mathbb{N}$, the approximating BSDE

$$dY_t^{m,p} = -\tfrac{1}{2} f^{m,p}(X_t)|Z_t^{m,p}|^2 dt + Z_t^{m,p}\, dW_t, \quad Y_T^{m,p} = g(X_T)$$

admits a unique bounded continuous solution $(v^{m,p}, w^{m,p})$, cf. [Kob00, Theorems 2.3 and 3.7]. Define the exit time $\tau_n = \inf\{u \ge 0 : X_u \notin B_n\}$. Comparison theorem for quadratic BSDE

implies $v^{m,p+1} \leq v^{m,p} \leq v^{m+1,p}$. It then follows from the monotone stability of quadratic BSDE (cf. [Kob00, Proposition 2.4]) that $Y^{m,p}_{\cdot\wedge\tau_n} = v^{m,p}(\cdot, X^{\tau_n}_{\cdot})$ increasingly converges to some process $Y^{p}_{\cdot\wedge\tau_n}$ as $m \to \infty$, and $Y^{p}_{\cdot\wedge\tau_n}$ decreasingly converges to $Y_{\cdot\wedge\tau_n} = v(\cdot, X^{\tau_n}_{\cdot})$, for some function v, as $p \to \infty$. The convergence of $Y^{m,p}_{\cdot\wedge\tau_n}$ to $Y_{\cdot\wedge\tau_n}$ is also uniform and $Z^{m,p}_{\cdot\wedge\tau_n}$ also converges to some $Z_{\cdot\wedge\tau_n}$ in bmo, cf. [BEK13, Theorems 4.5 and 4.7]. Sending $n \to \infty$, we obtain a solution to (3.7).

4. Proof of Theorem 2.5

Within this proof, all the constants Λ, T, d, N, etc., and functions $\{h_n\}$, $\{k^m_n\}$ which define the setting or appear in the assumptions of Theorem 2.5 will be thought of as *global variables*; any function of them will be treated as a constant, which we call an **universal constant**. For quantities dependent on additional parameters, we write, e.g., $C = C(\psi)$ to signal that, in addition to the global variables mentioned above, C also depends on ψ. In Hardy's manner, universal, constants will always be denoted by the letter C which may change from line to line, and they are always positive. To increase readability, we use the notation $\leq_C$ as follows

$$\text{`}a \leq_C b' \quad \text{stands for} \quad \text{`}a \leq C\, b'.$$

Furthermore, we fix both m and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and removing them almost entirely from the notation throughout this section. It is important to note, however, that our treatment of m and n will be different. One one hand, since we are after uniform estimates on the entire sequence $\{\boldsymbol{v}^m\}$, we do not allow any of our constants to depend on m. (We will see later that the dependence on $\{k^m_n\}$ is through its $\mathbb{L}^\infty$-norm which is assumed to be bounded uniformly in m.) On the other hand, all our analysis in this section will be restricted locally to the ball B_n. Therefore *n is be added, temporarily, to the list of universal constants* and all the estimates below will depend on it implicitly. Hence, for the time being, the conditions of Theorem 2.5 is localized to $x \in B_n$ and we simply assume, for the reminder of this section, that conditions of (1) - (4), with indices m and n removed, are satisfied. In particular, we assume that there exists constants $\alpha, b, c, \ell > 0$ and $q > 1 + d/2$ such that

$$||\boldsymbol{v}||_{\mathbb{L}^\infty([0,T]\times B_n)} \leq c \quad \text{and} \quad ||\boldsymbol{g}||_{C^\alpha(B_n)} \leq b. \tag{4.1}$$

There exists a Lyapunov pair $(h, k) \in \mathbf{Ly}(\boldsymbol{f}, 2c)$ on B_n such that

$$\|k\|_{\mathbb{L}^q([0,T]\times B_n)} \leq \ell \quad \text{and} \quad |\boldsymbol{f}(t, x, \boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{z})| \leq M(|\boldsymbol{z}|^2 + k(t, x)), \tag{4.2}$$

for all $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times B_n$ and $\boldsymbol{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times d}$. The α, b, c, ℓ and q are also added to the list of universal constants.

4.1. A "testing" Lemma.

As we already mentioned, for each initial condition, the SDE (2.1) admits a unique strong solution $X^{t,x} = (X^{t,x}_u)_{u\in[t,T]}$. For notational convenience in several proofs below, we allow X to start from negative time, i.e. $t \leq 0$. Therefore we extend b and σ via

$$b(t, x) = b(0, x) \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma(t, x) = \sigma(0, x) \quad \text{for } t \leq 0.$$

These extended coefficients still satisfy conditions (1)-(3) after (2.1), ensuring the existence of he unique strong solution, which is still denoted by $X^{t,x} = (X^{t,x}_u)_{u\in[t,T]}$. Its infinitesimal generator is given by

$$\mathcal{L} = \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^d b_i(\cdot,\cdot)\, D_i + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^d a(\cdot,\cdot)\, D_{ij}. \tag{4.3}$$

Parameterized by (t,x), the laws of these solutions constitute a Markov family $(\mathbb{P}^{t,x})_{(t,x)\in(-\infty,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d}$ of probability measures on $C([0,T]\to\mathbb{R}^d)$. (Even through the canonical process may start from negative time, we only focus on its trajectory on $[0,T]$.) In a minimal notational overload, we use X for the coordinate map on $C([0,T]\to\mathbb{R}^d)$ and set throughout

$$\boldsymbol{Y}_u=\boldsymbol{v}(u,X_u)\quad\text{ and }\quad\boldsymbol{Z}_u=\boldsymbol{w}(u,X_u)\quad\text{for } u\in[t\vee 0,T]. \tag{4.4}$$

A $C^{1,2}$-function $\varphi:[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d\to[0,1]$ is said to be **testable** if its support is contained in $[0,T]\times B_n$ and we have $\Gamma_\varphi<\infty$, where

$$\Gamma_\varphi:=\sup_{(t,x)\,:\,\varphi(t,x)>0}\Big(\Big|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial t}\varphi\Big|+|D\varphi\,b|+\tfrac12\Big|D^2\varphi:a\Big|+\tfrac{1}{\varphi}\,|D\varphi|^2\Big).$$

Lemma 4.1. *With c as in (4.1), there exists a universal constant $C>0$ such that, for each $\boldsymbol{c}\in\mathbb{R}^N$ with $|\boldsymbol{c}|\le c$, all $t'\in[t\vee 0,T]$, $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$, and any testable φ, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}^{t,x}\Big[\int_{t'}^T\mathbf{1}_{\{\varphi(u,X_u)=1\}}\,|\boldsymbol{Z}_u|^2\,du\Big]\le_C\Gamma_\varphi\,\mathbb{E}^{t,x}\Big[\int_{t'}^T\mathbf{1}_{\{\varphi(u,X_u)\in(0,1)\}}\,|\boldsymbol{Y}_u-\boldsymbol{c}|^2\,du\Big]+$$
$$+\,\mathbb{E}^{t,x}\Big[\int_{t'}^T\mathbf{1}_{\{\varphi(u,X_u)>0\}}\,k(u,X_u)\,du\Big]+\mathbb{E}^{t,x}[\mathbf{1}_{\{\varphi(T,X_T)>0\}}\,|\boldsymbol{Y}_T-\boldsymbol{c}|^2],$$

where the expectation $\mathbb{E}^{t,x}$ is with respect to $\mathbb{P}^{t,x}$.

Proof. We overload the notation by writing φ for both the process $\varphi(\cdot,X)$ and the function φ; similarly, having fixed $\boldsymbol{c}\in\mathbb{R}^N$ with $|\boldsymbol{c}|\le c$, we write h^c both for the function $h(\cdot-\boldsymbol{c})$ and the process $h(\boldsymbol{Y}-\boldsymbol{c})$. We define the product process $F=\varphi h^c=\varphi(\cdot,X)h(\boldsymbol{Y}-\boldsymbol{c})$ and write down the semimartingale decompositions (under any $\mathbb{P}^{t,x}$)

$$d\varphi=(\tfrac{\partial}{\partial u}\varphi+\mathcal{L}\varphi)\,du+D\varphi\,\sigma\,dW$$

and

$$dh^c=\Big(\tfrac12D^2h^c:\langle\boldsymbol{Z},\boldsymbol{Z}\rangle_a-Dh^c\,\boldsymbol{f}\Big)\,du+Dh^c\,\boldsymbol{Z}\,\sigma\,dW. \tag{4.5}$$

Reminding the reader that $dF\overset{m}{=}\alpha$ means that $F-\int_0^\cdot\alpha_s\,ds$ is a local martingale, we conclude that

$$dF\overset{m}{=}\varphi\Big(\tfrac12D^2h^c:\langle\boldsymbol{Z},\boldsymbol{Z}\rangle_a-Dh^c\,\boldsymbol{f}\Big)+h^c(\tfrac{\partial}{\partial u}\varphi+\mathcal{L}\varphi)+\langle Dh^c\boldsymbol{Z},D\varphi\rangle_a. \tag{4.6}$$

The C^2-regularity of the function h and the fact that $h(\boldsymbol{0})=Dh(\boldsymbol{0})=\boldsymbol{0}$ imply that there exists a constant $C>0$ which depends only on h and c such that

$$h^c(\boldsymbol{y})\le C|\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{c}|^2\quad\text{ and }\quad|Dh^c(\boldsymbol{y})|^2\le C|\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{c}|^2\quad\text{for all }\boldsymbol{y}\text{ with }|\boldsymbol{y}|\le c. \tag{4.7}$$

The fact that $(h,k)\in\mathbf{Ly}(\boldsymbol{f},2c)$ coupled with the boundedness of a and the fact that $|\boldsymbol{Y}-\boldsymbol{c}|\le 2c$, imply that the right-hand side of (4.6) above is bounded from below by

$$\varphi(|\boldsymbol{Z}|^2-k)-C\,|\boldsymbol{Y}-\boldsymbol{c}|^2\Big|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial t}\varphi+\mathcal{L}\varphi\Big|-\textstyle\sum_{il}\Big(\frac12\varphi(Z_{il})^2+C\frac{1}{2\varphi}(D_ih^c\,D_l\varphi)^2\Big)\mathbf{1}_{\varphi>0}\ge$$
$$\ge\tfrac12\varphi\,|\boldsymbol{Z}|^2-\varphi k-C\,|\boldsymbol{Y}-\boldsymbol{c}|^2\Big(\Big|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial u}\varphi+\mathcal{L}\varphi\Big|+\tfrac{1}{\varphi}\,|D\varphi|^2\Big)\mathbf{1}_{\varphi>0}.$$

It remains take the expectation and use boundedness of F (implied by the boundedness of φ and $\boldsymbol{Y}$ on $[0,T]\times B_n$, as well as continuity of h^c) and its positivity. □

4.2. **First consequences of the regularity of transition densities.** It follows from the conditions imposed on σ and b (see [SV06, Theorem 3.2.1, p. 71]) that the Markov family $(\mathbb{P}^{t,x})$ admits a family of transition densities

$$p(t,x;t',x'), \qquad t' \in [t,T], x' \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Moreover, they satisfy the following fundamental estimate (known as the Aronson's estimate): there exist constants $\underline{\sigma}, \overline{\sigma} > 0$, as well as $\underline{C}, \overline{C} > 0$, depending only on the $\mathbb{L}^\infty$- and ellipticity bounds on b and σ, such that, for all $0 \le t < t' \le T$ and all $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have

$$\tfrac{\underline{C}}{(t-t')^{d/2}}\, e^{-\frac{r}{2\underline{\sigma}^2}} \le p(t,x;t',x') \le \tfrac{\overline{C}}{(t-t')^{d/2}}\, e^{-\frac{r}{2\overline{\sigma}^2}} \text{ where } r = \tfrac{|x'-x|^2}{t'-t}. \tag{4.8}$$

Remark 4.2. Under our assumptions (cf. conditions (1)-(3) after (2.1)), the upper bound in (4.8) can be obtained by the parametrix method (see [Fri64, equation (6.12), p. 24]). The lower bound was first obtained in the paraboloid $|x'-x|^2 \le \text{const}(t'-t)$ by [IKO62, equation (4.75)], then extended globally by a standard chaining argument. When b and σ are only measurable and $\mathcal{L}$ is in the divergence form, (4.8) was obtained by [Aro67, Theorem 1].

The first consequence of the estimates (4.8) is the following uniform boundedness result:

Lemma 4.3. *There exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}^{t,x}\left[\int_t^T \Big(|\boldsymbol{Z}_u|^2 + k(u,X_u)\Big)\mathbf{1}_{\{X_u \in B_n\}}\, du\right] \le C,$$

for all $t, x \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$.

Proof. Let χ be a testable function, such that, for all $t \in [0,T]$, $\chi(t,x) = 1$ for $x \in B_{n-1}$ and $\chi(t,x) = 0$ for $x \in B_n^c$. According to Lemma 4.1 and the boundedness of $\boldsymbol{v}$ on $[0,T] \times B_n$, there exists a universal constant $C = C(\chi)$ such that, uniformly over $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}^{t,x}\Big[\int_t^T |\boldsymbol{Z}_u|^2\, \mathbf{1}_{\{X_u \in B_{n-1}\}}\, du\Big] \le_C 1 + \mathbb{E}^{t,x}\Big[\int_t^T k(u,X_u)\mathbf{1}_{\{X_u \in B_n\}}\, du\Big].$$

By Hölder's inequality with $1/q + 1/q' = 1$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}^{t,x}\Big[\int_t^T k(u,X_u)\mathbf{1}_{\{X_u \in B_n\}}\, du\Big] = \int_t^T \int_{B_n} k(u,\xi)p(t,x,u;\xi)\, du\, d\xi \le$$
$$\le ||k||_{\mathbb{L}^q([0,T]\times B_n)} \Big(\int_t^T \int_{B_n} p(t,x,u;\xi)^{q'}\, du\, d\xi\Big)^{1/q'}.$$

The proof is completed once we ues the upper bound in (4.8) and the fact that $q' < 1 + 2/d$ to obtain

$$\int_t^T \int_{B_n} p(t,x;u,\xi)^{q'}\, du\, d\xi \le_C \int_t^T (u-t)^{-\frac{d}{2}(q'-1)} \Big(\int_{B_n} (u-t)^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-\frac{q'|\xi-x|^2}{2\overline{\sigma}^2(u-t)}} d\xi\Big)\, du$$
$$\le_C \int_t^T (u-t)^{-\frac{d}{2}(q'-1)}\, du \le T^{1-\frac{d}{2(q-1)}}. \qquad \square$$

The uniform bound of Lemma 4.3 helps provide the following fundamental relation between $\boldsymbol{w}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$.

Lemma 4.4. *$\boldsymbol{w}$ is the weak (spatial) Jacobian $D\boldsymbol{v}$ of $\boldsymbol{v}$ on $(0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d$.*

Proof. Given $\epsilon\in(0,T/2)$ and the testable function χ from the proof of Lemma 4.3, we define

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}(t,x)=\boldsymbol{v}(t,x)\chi(t,x)\quad\text{ for } t,x\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d,$$

and let the sequence $\{\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(l)}\}$ (with $l\geq 1/\epsilon$) of approximations to $\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}$ be given by

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(l)}(t,x)=l\int_t^{t+1/l}\mathbb{E}^{t,x}[\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}(u,X_u)]\,du\quad\text{ for } t,x\in[0,T-\epsilon]\times\mathbb{R}^d.$$

The functions $(\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(l)})$ are uniformly bounded (by c, in fact), and, thanks to smoothness of the transition densities of X, each $\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(l)}$ is $C^{1,2}$-differentiable. Moreover, as one readily checks, we have

$$(\tfrac{d}{dt}+\mathcal{L})\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(l)}(t,x)=l\Big(\mathbb{E}^{t,x}[\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}(t+1/l,X_{t+1/l})]-\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}(t,x)\Big).$$

Having fixed a pair $(t,x)\in[0,T-\epsilon]\times\mathbb{R}^d$, we apply Itô's formula to $\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}(\cdot,X^{t,x})$, use the boundedness of $\boldsymbol{v}$ on $[0,T]\times B_n$ in the second inequality below, and recall the second inequality in (4.2) in the last inequality, to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big|(\tfrac{d}{dt}+\mathcal{L})\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(l)}(t,x)\Big|\leq_C\, & l\,\mathbb{E}^{t,x}\Big[\int_t^{t+1/l}|\boldsymbol{v}(u,X_u)|\,\Big|(\tfrac{d}{dt}+\mathcal{L})\chi(u,X_u)\Big|\,du\Big]\\
&+l\,\mathbb{E}^{t,x}\Big[\int_t^{t+1/l}\chi(u,X_u)|\boldsymbol{f}(u,X_u,\boldsymbol{Y}_u,\boldsymbol{Z}_u)|du\Big]\\
&+l\,\mathbb{E}^{t,x}\Big[\int_t^{t+1/l}|D\chi(u,X_u)|\,|\boldsymbol{Z}_u|\,du\Big]\\
\leq_C\, & 1+l\,\mathbb{E}^{t,x}\Big[\int_t^{t+1/l}\chi(u,X_u)\,|\boldsymbol{f}(u,X_u,\boldsymbol{Y}_u,\boldsymbol{Z}_u)|\,du\Big]\\
&+\mathbb{E}^{t,x}\Big[\int_t^{t+1/l}\mathbf{1}_{\{\chi(u,X_u)>0\}}\,|\boldsymbol{Z}_u|^2\,du\Big]\\
\leq_C\, & 1+l\,\mathbb{E}^{t,x}\Big[\int_t^{t+1/l}(k(u,X_u)+|\boldsymbol{Z}_u|^2)\mathbf{1}_{\{X_u\in B_n\}}\,du\Big],
\end{aligned}$$

for a universal constant $C=C(\chi)$. The Markov property of the family $(\mathbb{P}^{t,x})$ now implies that, with $\boldsymbol{Z}'_s=\boldsymbol{w}(s,X'_s)$, where X' denotes the coordinate process inside the $\mathbb{P}^{u,X_u}$-expectation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}^{t,x}\Big[\int_t^{T-\epsilon}\Big|(\tfrac{d}{dt}+\mathcal{L})\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(l)}(u,X_u)\Big|\,du\Big]\\
&\leq_C 1+\mathbb{E}^{t,x}\Big[\int_t^{T-\epsilon}\mathbb{E}^{u,X_u}\Big[l\int_u^{u+1/l}\Big(|\boldsymbol{Z}'_s|^2+k(s,X'_s)\mathbf{1}_{\{X'_s\in B_n\}}\Big)\,ds\Big]du\Big]\\
&=1+\mathbb{E}^{t,x}\Big[\int_t^{T-\epsilon}l\int_u^{u+1/l}\Big(|\boldsymbol{Z}_s|^2+k(s,X_s)\Big)\mathbf{1}_{\{X_s\in B_n\}}\,ds\;du\Big]\\
&\leq_C 1+\mathbb{E}^{t,x}\Big[\int_t^{T-\epsilon}\Big(|\boldsymbol{Z}_s|^2+k(s,X_s)\Big)\mathbf{1}_{\{X_s\in B_n\}}\,ds\Big]\leq C,\quad\text{for all }\ell,
\end{aligned}\tag{4.9}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 4.3; the constant C obtained above is also uniform for all $t, x \in [0, T-\epsilon] \times \mathbb{R}^d$.

Continuity of $\boldsymbol{v}$ implies that $\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}$ is also continuous, and, hence, uniformly continuous on compacts. For any $\tilde{\epsilon} > 0$, there exists $\delta = \delta(\tilde{\epsilon}, n) \in (0,1)$ such that

$$|\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}(t,x) - \hat{\boldsymbol{v}}(t',x')| \le \tilde{\epsilon} \quad \text{if} \quad |(t,x)-(t',x')| \le \delta \text{ and } |x| \le n+1.$$

The difference above vanishes if $|(t,x)-(t',x')| \le \delta$ and $|x| > n+1$, since, in that case, $x, x' \notin \text{supp}\chi$. Therefore, using the boundedness of $\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}$ and the upper bound in (4.8), for $(t,x) \in [0, T-\epsilon] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(l)}(t,x) - \hat{\boldsymbol{v}}(t,x)\right| \le & \iint\limits_{[t,\,t+1/l]\times\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbf{1}_{\{|\xi-x|>\delta\}} \left|\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}(u,\xi) - \hat{\boldsymbol{v}}(t,x)\right| l\, p(t,x;u,\xi)\, du\, d\xi \\
& + \iint\limits_{[t,\,t+1/l]\times\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbf{1}_{\{|\xi-x|\le\delta, |x|\le n+1\}} \left|\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}(u,\xi) - \hat{\boldsymbol{v}}(t,x)\right| l\, p(t,x;u,\xi)\, du\, d\xi \\
\le_C & \, l \int_0^{1/l} \int_{|\xi|\ge\delta} u^{-d/2} e^{-\frac{|\xi|^2}{2\overline{\sigma}^2 u}}\, d\xi\, du + \tilde{\epsilon} \\
\le_C & \, l \int_0^{1/l} (1 - \Phi(\delta/\sqrt{\overline{\sigma}^2 u}))\, du + \tilde{\epsilon},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the distribution function for standard normal. Note that $\lim_{u\downarrow 0} \Phi(\delta/\sqrt{\overline{\sigma}^2 u}) = 1$. The last expression is less than $2\tilde{\epsilon}$, for sufficiently large l, uniformly for $t, x \in [0, T-\epsilon] \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Since the choice of $\tilde{\epsilon}$ is arbitrary, the previous estimates implies the uniform convergence of $\{\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(l)}\}$ to $\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}$ on $[0, T-\epsilon] \times \mathbb{R}^d$.

Setting $\hat{\boldsymbol{Y}}^{(l)} = \hat{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(l)}(\cdot, X^{0,x})$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{v}}(\cdot, X^{0,x})$, we use the uniform convergence of $\{\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(l)}\}$ to obtain $\hat{\boldsymbol{Y}}^{(l)} \to \hat{\boldsymbol{Y}}$, uniformly. Applying Itô's formula to $|\hat{\boldsymbol{Y}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{Y}}^{(l)}|^2$ and using (4.9), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}^{0,x}\left[\langle \hat{\boldsymbol{Y}}^{(l)} - \hat{\boldsymbol{Y}} \rangle_{T-\epsilon}\right] \le_C \left\| \sup_{u\in[0,T-\epsilon]} |\hat{\boldsymbol{Y}}^{(l)}_u - \hat{\boldsymbol{Y}}_u| \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty},$$

which converges to 0. This means that

$$\lim_l \int_0^{T-\epsilon} \int_{B_n} g_l^2(u,\xi)\, p(0,x;u,\xi)\, du\, d\xi = 0, \quad \text{where } g_l = \left|(\chi \boldsymbol{w} + \boldsymbol{v} D\chi - D\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(l)})\sigma\right|.$$

By the lower bound in (4.8), the density $p(0,x;\cdot,\cdot)$ is bounded away from 0 on $[\epsilon, T-\epsilon] \times B_n$ and σ is uniformly elliptic. Therefore, $D\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(l)} \to \chi \boldsymbol{w} + \boldsymbol{v} D\chi$ in $\mathbb{L}^2([\epsilon, T-\epsilon] \times B_n)$, as $l \to \infty$. Coupled with the fact that $\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(l)} \to \hat{\boldsymbol{v}}$ also in $\mathbb{L}^2([\epsilon, T-\epsilon] \times B_n)$, this implies that $\chi \boldsymbol{w} + \boldsymbol{v} D\chi$ is the weak Jacobian of $\boldsymbol{v}\chi$. The statement follows by noting that for each compact $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, $\chi \boldsymbol{w} + \boldsymbol{v} D\chi = \boldsymbol{w}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}\chi = \boldsymbol{v}$ on $[0,T] \times K$, for large enough n, and the choice of ϵ is arbitrary. □

4.3. **Uniform local estimates.** We now choose and fix $R \in (0, 1/4]$ and a pair $(t_0, x_0) \in [0,T] \times B_{n-1}$. It is important to note that *none* of the constants in the sequence of lemmas in the next two subsections depends on the choice of (t_0, x_0) and R.

We will use the point (t_0, x_0) (or only x_0) as the origin throughout the proof and dilate the coordinate system around it with the change of variables $(t, x) \to (\tau, \xi)$, given by

$$x = x_0 + R\xi \quad \text{and} \quad t = t_0 + R^2\tau.$$

Most balls, cylinders, etc. in the sequel will be centered around (t_0, x_0) (or x_0) and their dimensions (radius, etc) will have much nicer expressions in the (τ, ξ)-coordinates, so we introduce the following notation:

$$\beta(\rho) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \,:\, |x - x_0| \le \rho R\}, \text{ and}$$
$$\gamma(\theta; \rho) = \Big\{(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \,:\, t_0 \le t \le t_0 + \theta R^2, |x - x_0| \le \rho R\Big\},$$

for the ball β and the parabolic cylinder γ.

Typically, a function $\tilde{\varphi} : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ will be defined in (τ, ξ)-coordinates, and then its counterpart

$$\varphi(t, x) = \tilde{\varphi}\left(\tfrac{t-t_0}{R^2}, \tfrac{x-x_0}{R}\right), \tag{4.10}$$

restricted to $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$, is used in computations. A similar notation will be used for functions of x only or for subsets of $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ or $\mathbb{R}^d$ (identified with their indicators). In the same spirit, we set $\tilde{T} = (T - t_0)/(R^2)$.

Within this proof, $\int$ denotes the integral over R^d, while $\iint$ stands for the integral over $[t_0, T]\times\mathbb{R}^d$. If the domain of integration is notationally further restricted, as e.g., in $\iint_D$, the integral is taken over $([t_0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \cap D$ (or $\mathbb{R}^d \cap D$ in the spatial case). Similarly, in order to avoid repeated explicit minimization with T, we assume that temporal variables cannot take values above T, so that, for example, the interval $[t_0, t_0 + 4R^2]$ coincides with $[t_0, T]$, when $t_0 + 4R^2 > T$. Meanwhile, as we mentioned before, t in $\mathbb{P}^{t,x}$ is allowed to be negative.

We continue with some consequences of (4.8) which will be used in the sequel. Given the origin (t_0, x_0) and the radius R fixed above, we introduce the following shortcut

$$p_\varepsilon(t, x) = p(t_0 - \varepsilon R^2, x_0; t, x), \qquad \text{for } \varepsilon \ge 0, \tag{4.11}$$

for the transition density, and state several useful estimates where the functions $\Delta_\sigma, \delta_\sigma$ are given by

$$\Delta_\sigma(\varepsilon) = \exp(-\tfrac{1}{2\sigma^2}\varepsilon^{-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_\sigma(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon^{-d/2}\Delta_\sigma(\varepsilon), \tag{4.12}$$

and extended to $\varepsilon = 0$, $\varepsilon = +\infty$ by continuity. We also define the positive (universal) constant ε_0 by

$$\varepsilon_0 = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 \,:\, \delta_{\overline{\sigma}}(\varepsilon) = 1/2\} \wedge \min(1, (\overline{\sigma}^2 d)^{-1}). \tag{4.13}$$

Note that $\delta_{\overline{\sigma}}(\epsilon)$ is increasing on $[0, (\overline{\sigma}^2 d)^{-1}]$ and decreasing on $[(\overline{\sigma}^2 d)^{-1}, \infty)$ with $\delta_{\overline{\sigma}}(0) = 0$. Therefore the definition of ϵ_0 implies $\delta_{\overline{\sigma}}(\epsilon) \le \delta_{\overline{\sigma}}(\epsilon_0) \le 1/2$ for $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]$. The role of ϵ_0 will be clear in Proposition 4.16 below.

Lemma 4.5. *There exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that, for all $(t,x) \in \gamma(4,4)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0/2]$, we have*

$$p_\varepsilon(t,x) \le_C R^{-d} \qquad \text{when } (t,x) \notin \gamma(1/4;1/2), \tag{4.14}$$

$$p_\varepsilon(t,x) \ge_C R^{-d}\, \delta_{\underline{\sigma}/4}(\varepsilon_0/2+\varepsilon) \qquad \text{when } t \ge t_0 + \varepsilon_0 R^2/2, \tag{4.15}$$

$$p_\varepsilon(t,x) \le_C R^{-d}\, \delta_{\overline{\sigma}}(\varepsilon_0/2+\varepsilon) \qquad \text{when } t < t_0 + \varepsilon_0 R^2/2 \text{ and } x \notin \beta(1). \tag{4.16}$$

Proof. We set $\bar\tau = \varepsilon + (t-t_0)/R^2 > 0$, $\xi = (x-x_0)/R$ and $r = \bar\tau/|\xi|^2 \in (0,\infty]$, and note that the bounds in the density estimates (4.8) can be represented in two forms (with the outer one holding only for $\xi \neq 0$):

$$|\xi|^{-d}\, \delta_{\underline{\sigma}}(r) = \bar\tau^{-\frac{d}{2}} \Delta_{\underline{\sigma}}(r) \le_C R^d\, p_\varepsilon(t,x) \le_C \bar\tau^{-\frac{d}{2}} \Delta_{\overline{\sigma}}(r) = |\xi|^{-d}\, \delta_{\overline{\sigma}}(r), \tag{4.17}$$

which will be used throughout the proof.

- Inequality (4.14): Both δ_σ and Δ_σ are bounded by a constant C on $[0,\infty]$, so, by the right-hand side of (4.17), we have

$$R^d p_\varepsilon(t,x) \le_C \max(|\xi|, \sqrt{\bar\tau})^{-d},$$

which, in turn, implies (4.14) since $\max(|\xi|, \sqrt{\bar\tau}) \ge 1/2$ on $\gamma(1/4;1/2)^c$.

- Inequality (4.15): Under the conditions of (4.15), we have $r \ge \bar\tau/16$, and so, by monotonicity of $\Delta_{\underline{\sigma}}$ and (4.17), we have

$$R^d\, p_\varepsilon(t,x) \ge_C \bar\tau^{-d/2} \Delta_{\underline{\sigma}}(r) \ge_C \delta_{\underline{\sigma}}(\bar\tau/16) \ge_C \delta_{\underline{\sigma}/4}(\bar\tau).$$

The function $\delta_{\underline{\sigma}/4}$ attains it maximum at $16(\underline{\sigma}^2 d)^{-1}$, and is nondecreasing to the left of it and nonincreasing and positive to the right. Since $\varepsilon_0/2 + \varepsilon \le \bar\tau$, in the case that $\bar\tau \le 16(\underline{\sigma}^2 d)^{-1}$, we have $\delta_{\underline{\sigma}/4}(\bar\tau) \ge \delta_{\underline{\sigma}/4}(\varepsilon_0/2+\varepsilon)$. On the other hand, if $\bar\tau \in (16(\underline{\sigma}^2 d)^{-1}, 4\frac12]$, we have

$$\delta_{\underline{\sigma}/4}(\varepsilon_0/2+\varepsilon) \le \delta_{\underline{\sigma}/4}(16(\underline{\sigma}^2 d)^{-1}) \le_C \delta_{\underline{\sigma}/4}(4\tfrac12) \le \delta_{\underline{\sigma}/4}(\bar\tau).$$

Both alternatives lead to (4.15).

- Inequality (4.16): The conditions of (4.16) translate into $\bar\tau \le \varepsilon_0/2 + \varepsilon \le (\overline{\sigma}^2 d)^{-1}$, as well as $r \le \bar\tau$ (since $|\xi| \ge 1$). The function $\delta_{\overline{\sigma}}$ is nondecreasing on $[0, (\overline{\sigma}^2 d)^{-1}]$, so the (4.17) implies

$$R^d\, p_\varepsilon(t,x) \le_C \delta_{\overline{\sigma}}(r) \le \delta_{\overline{\sigma}}(\varepsilon_0/2+\varepsilon). \qquad \square$$

An operational form of Lemma 4.1, stated in Proposition 4.7 below, employs a particular testing function φ, obtained via (4.10) from a function $\tilde\varphi : \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d \to [0,1]$ in the class $C^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying

$$\tilde\varphi(\tau,\xi) = 1, \text{ when } \tau \le 1 \text{ and } |\xi| \le 1,\ \tilde\varphi(\tau,\xi) = 0, \text{ when } \tau \ge 4 \text{ or } |\xi| \ge 2,$$

and $\tilde\varphi(\tau,\xi) \in (0,1)$ otherwise. By making sure that the $\tilde\varphi$ decreases fast enough (quadratically, for example) towards its 0-level set, one can also guarantee the boundedness of $|D\tilde\varphi|^2/\tilde\varphi$. For the corresponding function φ, expressed in the original coordinates (as defined in (4.10)), we easily check that, relative to the set $[t_0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\{\varphi = 1\} = \gamma(1;1) \quad \text{and} \quad \{\varphi = 0\} = \overline{\gamma(4;2)^c},$$

and that the quantity Γ_φ is independent of the choice of (t_0, x_0). Due to $R \leq 1/4$, we have $|D\varphi b| \leq_C \frac{1}{R^2}|D\tilde{\varphi} b|$. Therefore Γ_φ satisfies

$$\Gamma_\varphi \leq_C \tfrac{1}{R^2}\Gamma_{\tilde{\varphi}}. \tag{4.18}$$

Finally, the support of $\varphi(t,\cdot)$ is a subset of B_n, this follows from $x_0 \in B_{n-1}$, supp $\tilde{\varphi}(\tau,\cdot) = B_2$, and $R \leq 1/4$.

Lemma 4.6. *For p_ϵ defined in (4.11), there exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that, with $\frac{1}{q'} = 1 - \frac{1}{q}$ we have*

$$\iint_{\gamma(4;2)} kp_\epsilon \leq_C (2R \wedge \sqrt{T})^{2-\frac{2+d}{q}}. \tag{4.19}$$

Proof. By (4.8), with $t_\epsilon = t_0 - \varepsilon R^2$, we have

$$\iint_{\gamma(4;2)} p_\varepsilon^{q'} \leq_C \int_{[t_0, t_0+4R^2]} (t-t_\epsilon)^{-\frac{d}{2}(q'-1)} \Big(\int_{\beta(2)} (t-t_\epsilon)^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-\frac{q'|x-x_0|^2}{2\overline{\sigma}^2(t-t_\epsilon)}} dx \Big) dt \leq_C$$

$$\leq_C \int_{[t_0, t_0+4R^2]} (t-t_\epsilon)^{-\frac{d}{2}(q'-1)} dt \leq \int_{[t_0, t_0+4R^2]} (t-t_0)^{-\frac{d}{2}(q'-1)} dt \leq_C (2R \wedge \sqrt{T})^{2-\frac{d}{q-1}}.$$

The previous inequality, combined with Hölder's inequality in the form $\iint kp_\epsilon \leq ||k||_{\mathbb{L}^q} (\iint p_\epsilon^{q'})^{1/q'}$, establishes the statement. □

Reminding the reader that the constant c is defined in (4.1), we state the following result which is a combination of Lemma 4.1, applied with the testing function φ introduced above, and Lemmas 4.4, 4.6, together with (4.18).

Proposition 4.7. *There exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and all $\boldsymbol{c}$ with $|\boldsymbol{c}| \leq c$, we have*

$$\iint_{\gamma(1;1)} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2 p_\varepsilon \leq_C R^{-2} \iint_{\gamma(4;2)\setminus\gamma(1;1)} |\boldsymbol{v}-\boldsymbol{c}|^2 p_\varepsilon + \mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{T}\leq 4\}} \int_{\beta(2)} |\boldsymbol{g}-\boldsymbol{c}|^2 p_\varepsilon(T,\cdot) + (2R \wedge \sqrt{T})^{2-\frac{2+d}{q}}. \tag{4.20}$$

4.4. **A weighted Poincaré inequality and Struwe's lemma.** Next we state a weighted Poincaré inequality in Lemma 4.8 below. Let $\tilde{D}$ be a Lipschitz domain (nonempty open connected set) in $\mathbb{R}^d$, and let D be its translate/dilate as described around (4.10). Similarly, let $\tilde{\chi}$ be a **weight** function, i.e., such that $\tilde{\chi} \in \mathbb{L}^\infty(\tilde{D})$ and $\int_{\tilde{D}} \tilde{\chi} > 0$, and let χ be its translated/dilated version. Given a function $u \in \mathbb{L}^1(D)$, we define its χ-**average**

$$\bar{u}_D^\chi = \frac{1}{\int_D \chi} \int_D u\chi.$$

The special case $\chi = 1$ is denoted simply by $\bar{u}_D$. For a vector-valued function $\boldsymbol{u}$, the same notation is used, but with averaging is applied component-wise. When the domain D is omitted, it is assumed that $D = \operatorname{Int}\operatorname{supp}\chi$.

In keeping with the notational philosophy of the proof, $\tilde{D}$ and $\tilde{\chi}$ are thought of as prototypes, and D and χ as the family of their homothetic copies, indexed by t_0, x_0, and R. As above, the

main message behind our results below is that estimates can be made independently (or explicitly dependently) of those indices. Here, $||\cdot||$ denotes the $\mathbb{L}^2$-norm on D and $H^1(D)$ the Sobolev space $W^{1,2}$ on D.

Lemma 4.8. *Given $\tilde{D}$ and $\tilde{\chi}$ as above, there exists a universal constant $C = C(\tilde{D}, \tilde{\chi})$ such that for all $u \in H^1(D)$ we have*

$$||u - \bar{u}^{\chi}_D||^2 \leq_C R^2 \, ||Du||^2,$$

Proof. For $w \in \mathbb{L}^2(\tilde{D})$, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$||w - \tfrac{1}{|\tilde{D}|}\int_{\tilde{D}} w|| \, ||\tilde{\chi} - \tfrac{1}{|\tilde{D}|}\int_{\tilde{D}} \tilde{\chi}|| \geq \left|\int_{\tilde{D}} w\tilde{\chi} - \tfrac{1}{|\tilde{D}|}\int_{\tilde{D}} w \int_{\tilde{D}} \tilde{\chi}\right| = \left|\int_{\tilde{D}} \tilde{\chi}\right| \left|\overline{w}^{\tilde{\chi}}_{\tilde{D}} - \overline{w}_{\tilde{D}}\right|.$$

If, additionally, $w \in H^1(\tilde{D})$, then, combining the previous inequality and Poincaré's inequality, we have

$$||w - \overline{w}^{\tilde{\chi}}_{\tilde{D}}||^2 \leq 2(\overline{w}_{\tilde{D}} - \overline{w}^{\tilde{\chi}}_{\tilde{D}})^2 + 2||w - \overline{w}_{\tilde{D}}||^2 \leq C||w - \overline{w}_{\tilde{D}}||^2 \leq C||\nabla w||^2,$$

with C depending only on $\tilde{D}$ and $\tilde{\chi}$. It remains to set $w(\xi) = u(x_0 + R\xi)$. □

Next, let us pick a (weight function) $\tilde{\psi} : \mathbb{R}^d \to [0,1]$ such that

$$\tilde{\psi}(\xi) = 0, \text{ for } |\xi| \leq \tfrac{1}{2} \text{ or } |\xi| \geq 4, \quad \tilde{\psi}(\xi) = 1, \text{ for } 1 \leq |\xi| \leq 2, \tag{4.21}$$

and $\tilde{\psi}(\xi) \in (0,1)$, otherwise, and consider its version ψ in the x-coordinates.

Lemma 4.9. *When $d \geq 2$, there exists a universal constant $C = C(\tilde{\psi})$ such that, for any $u \in H^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we have*

$$\int_{\beta(2)\setminus\beta(1)} \left|u - \overline{u}^{\psi}\right|^2 \leq_C R^2 \int_{\beta(4)\setminus\beta(1/2)} |Du|^2 .$$

The same inequality holds when the domain of the left integral is replaced by $\beta(2)$ and that of right one is replaced by $\beta(4)$, but d is allowed to be 1 in this case.

Proof. With $\tilde{D}$ such that $D = \beta(4)\setminus\beta(1/2)$, we observe that $\operatorname{supp}\psi \subseteq D$ and that $\beta(2)\setminus\beta(1) \subseteq D$. Therefore, applying Lemma 4.8, we have

$$\int_{\beta(2)\setminus\beta(1)} \left|u - \overline{u}^{\psi}\right|^2 \leq \int_D \left|u - \overline{u}^{\psi}_D\right|^2 \leq_C R^2 \int_D |Du|^2 .$$

The proof is the same when $\beta(2) \setminus \beta(1)$ is replaced by $\beta(2)$ and $D = \beta(4)$. □

Remark 4.10. When $d = 1$, the set $\beta(4) \setminus \beta(1/2) = [-4, -\frac{1}{2}] \cup [\frac{1}{2}, 4]$ is not connected, and, in fact, the statement of Lemma 4.9 does not hold. To see that, it is enough to consider $u = 1$ on $[-4, -\frac{1}{2}]$ and $u = 2$ on $[4, \frac{1}{2}]$. Then $\int_{\beta(4)\setminus\beta(1/2)} |Du|^2 = 0$, but $1 < \overline{u}^{\psi} < 2$ implies $\int_{\beta(2)\setminus\beta(1)} |u - \overline{u}^{\psi}|^2 > 0$.

On the other hand, let us argue that we can assume, without loss of generality, that $d \geq 2$ in Theorem 2.5. Indeed, suppose that we have established Theorem 2.5 for $d \geq 2$, but we are facing a situation where $d = 1$. In this case, we simply embed our one-dimensional problem into a two-dimensional one. More precisely, we define the new state process, perhaps on an enlarged probability space, as $\hat{X} = (X, B)$, where B is a Brownian motion independent of W. The so-obtained coefficients $\hat{b} = (b, 0)$ and $\hat{\sigma} = \operatorname{diag}(\sigma, 1)$ satisfy all the necessary assumptions. Furthermore, the

functions $\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}^m(t,x,x') = \boldsymbol{v}^m(t,x)$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{w}}^m(t,x,x') = (\boldsymbol{w}^m(t,x),\mathbf{0})$ is a Markovian solution to the system (2.5) on the enlarged probability space. The similarly defined $\hat{\boldsymbol{f}}^m$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}^m$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 2.5. In particular, for the Lyapunov pair in condition (4), the inequality (2.4) (with $\boldsymbol{f}$ and k_n replaced by $\boldsymbol{f}^m$ and k_n^m respectively) is satisfied for all $\hat{\boldsymbol{z}} = (\boldsymbol{z},\mathbf{0}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times 2}$. Therefore Theorem 2.5 implies that $\{\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}^m\}$ is uniformly locally Hölderian in its first two variables. As a result, Theorem 2.7 produces a locally Hölderian solution $(\hat{\boldsymbol{v}},\hat{\boldsymbol{w}})$ on the extended space. It remains to use locally uniform convergence and Lemma 4.4 to conclude that $\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}$ does not depend on the additional coordinate x' and that the second column of $\hat{\boldsymbol{w}}$ vanishes. Therefore $\boldsymbol{Y} = \hat{\boldsymbol{v}}(\cdot,X,0)$ and $\boldsymbol{Z} = \hat{\boldsymbol{w}}^1(\cdot,X,0)$ are adapted to the original filtration and solves the original system.

We consider $\tilde{\psi}$ as a global variable for the remainder of the proof. Consequently, the dependence of universal constants on it will be suppressed in sequel. The following Lemma generalizes an important result of Struwe (see [Str81, Lemma 4., p. 134])

Lemma 4.11. *There exists a universal constant C such that*

$$\left|\overline{\boldsymbol{v}(t_2,\cdot)}^{\psi} - \overline{\boldsymbol{v}(t_1,\cdot)}^{\psi}\right|^2 \leq_C R^{-d} \iint_{\gamma(\theta_2,4)\setminus(\gamma(\theta_1,4)\cup\gamma(\theta_2,1/2))} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2 + R^{2-\frac{2+d}{q}},$$

for all $0 \leq \theta_1 \leq \theta_2 \leq 4$, where $t_i = t_0 + \theta_i R^2$, $i = 1,2$.

Proof. We fix $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$, and, reminding the reader that $p_\varepsilon = p(t_0 - \varepsilon R^2, x_0, \cdot, \cdot)$, set $\eta = \psi/p_\varepsilon$. Itô's formula and Lemma 4.4, applied to the product $F_t = \eta(t,X_t)v^i(t,X_t)$ (with $X = X^{t_0-\varepsilon R^2,x_0}$) yields

$$d(\eta v^i) \overset{m}{=} -\eta f^i + v^i(\tfrac{\partial}{\partial t}\eta + \mathcal{L}\eta) + \langle Dv^i, D\eta\rangle_a.$$

Therefore, with $L = \mathbb{E}^\varepsilon[F_{t_2} - F_{t_1}] = \left(\overline{v^i(t_2,\cdot)}^{\psi} - \overline{v^i(t_1,\cdot)}^{\psi}\right)\int\psi$ and the understanding that all space-time integrals $\iint$ in the rest of the proof are over $\gamma(\theta_2,4)\setminus\gamma(\theta_1,4)$ we have

$$L = -\iint f^i\psi + \iint \left(p_\varepsilon v^i(\tfrac{\partial}{\partial t}\eta + \mathcal{L}\eta) + p_\epsilon\langle Dv^i, D\eta\rangle_a\right). \tag{4.22}$$

Since σ is bounded and globally Lipschitz, so is a, and the infinitesimal generator $\mathcal{L}$ can be written in a divergence form:

$$\mathcal{L} = \textstyle\sum_k \tilde{b}_k D_k + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j,k} D_j(a_{jk}D_k),$$

where $\tilde{b}_k = b_k - \frac{1}{2}\sum_j D_j(a_{jk})$ is bounded and $D_j(a_{jk})$ is the weak derivative of a_{jk}. Another consequence of the (regularity and ellipticity) assumptions imposed on σ is the fact that the transition density p_ε is smooth for $t > t_0$ and satisfies the forward Kolmogorov equation

$$\tfrac{\partial}{\partial t}p_\varepsilon = \mathcal{L}^*p_\varepsilon = -\textstyle\sum_k D_k(\tilde{b}_k p_\epsilon) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j,k} D_k(a_{jk}D_k p_\epsilon). \tag{4.23}$$

Furthermore, since ψ does not depend on t, we have $p_\varepsilon\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\eta + \eta\frac{\partial}{\partial t}p_\varepsilon = 0$, and, so,

$$\iint p_\varepsilon v^i\tfrac{\partial}{\partial t}\eta = -\iint \eta v^i\tfrac{\partial}{\partial t}p_\varepsilon = -\iint \eta v^i\mathcal{L}^*p_\varepsilon. \tag{4.24}$$

Using the divergence form of $\mathcal{L}^*$ in (4.23) and the fact that $\eta(t,\cdot)$ is supported in $\beta(4)$, we conclude that

$$-\int_{\beta(4)} \eta v^i \mathcal{L}^* p_\varepsilon = -\int_{\beta(4)} D(\eta v^i)\tilde{b}\, p_\epsilon + \tfrac{1}{2}\int_{\beta(4)} \langle D(\eta v^i), Dp_\varepsilon\rangle_a. \tag{4.25}$$

Similarly,

$$\int_{\beta(4)} p_\varepsilon v^i\, \mathcal{L}\eta = \int_{\beta(4)} D\eta\, \tilde{b}\, v^i\, p_\epsilon - \tfrac{1}{2}\int_{\beta(4)} \langle D(p_\varepsilon v^i), D\eta\rangle_a. \tag{4.26}$$

Finally, we integrate both (4.25) and (4.26) over $t \in [t_1, t_2]$, and combine them with (4.24), to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\iint \Big(p_\varepsilon v^i (\tfrac{\partial}{\partial t}\eta + \mathcal{L}\eta) + p_\varepsilon \langle Dv^i, D\eta\rangle_a \Big) = \\
&= \iint \Big(\tfrac{1}{2}\langle D(\eta v^i), Dp_\varepsilon\rangle_a - \tfrac{1}{2}\langle D(p_\varepsilon v^i), D\eta\rangle_a + p_\varepsilon\langle Dv^i, D\eta\rangle_a - D(\eta v^i)\tilde{b}p_\epsilon + D\eta\tilde{b}v^i p_\epsilon \Big) = \\
&= \iint \Big(\tfrac{1}{2}\langle Dv^i, D\psi\rangle_a - \psi Dv^i\tilde{b}\Big).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.27}$$

Next, we multiply both sides of (4.22) by $-L$ and use (4.27) together with the uniform ellipticity of σ and the fact that $|f^i| \le C(|D\boldsymbol{v}|^2 + k)$ to obtain

$$L^2 \le C\Big(|L| \iint |\psi|\, |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2 + |L| \iint |\psi|\, k + \iint (|LD\psi| + \big|L\psi\tilde{b}\big|)\, \big|Dv^i\big| \Big).$$

Hölder's inequality, applied to the third term on the right-hand side above, and use the fact that $|L| \le C||\boldsymbol{v}||_{\mathbb{L}^\infty} R^d$ for the first term yield

$$L^2 \le CR^d\Big(\iint \mathbf{1}_{\psi>0}\, |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2 + \iint \mathbf{1}_{\psi>0}\, k\Big) + \tfrac{1}{2}L^2 + \tfrac{1}{2}\iint (|D\psi| + \psi|\tilde{b}|)^2 \iint \mathbf{1}_{\psi>0}\, \big|Dv^i\big|^2.$$

To complete the proof, we use the first inequality in (4.2), apply Hölder's inequality to the integral $\iint \mathbf{1}_{\psi>0}k$, and use the boundedness of $\tilde{b}$ and $R \le 1/4$ to obtain $\iint \psi^2 \big|\tilde{b}\big|^2 \le_C R^d$ and

$$\int |D\psi|^2 = R^{d-2}\int \big|D\tilde{\psi}\big| \text{ so that } \iint |D\psi|^2 \le (\theta_2 - \theta_1)R^d \int \big|D\tilde{\psi}\big|^2 \le_C R^d. \qquad \square$$

Coming back to (4.20), we will estimate different terms on the right-hand side using Lemmas 4.9 and 4.11, together with a specific choice of $\boldsymbol{c}$.

Lemma 4.12. *There exists universal constant C such that, for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0/2]$ we have*

$$\sup_{\gamma(4;4)\setminus\gamma(1,1)} R^d \Big|\overline{\boldsymbol{v}(t,\cdot)}^{\psi} - \boldsymbol{c}\Big|^2 p_\varepsilon \le_C \iint\limits_{\gamma(4;\,4)\,\setminus\,\gamma(4;\,1/2)} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2 \Big(\tfrac{p_\varepsilon}{\delta_{\underline{\sigma}/4}(\varepsilon+\varepsilon_0/2)} + \tfrac{\delta_{\overline{\sigma}}(\varepsilon+\varepsilon_0/2)}{R^d}\Big) + R^{2-\frac{2+d}{q}},$$

where $\boldsymbol{c} = \overline{\boldsymbol{v}(t_0 + (\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_0 \wedge \tilde{T})R^2, \cdot)}^{\psi}$.

Proof. We fix $(t,x) \in \gamma(4;4)\setminus\gamma(1,1)$, set $\tilde{t} = (t-t_0)/R^2$ and define $\theta_1 = \min(\tilde{t}, (\varepsilon_0/2)\wedge\tilde{T})$, and $\theta_2 = \max(\tilde{t}, (\varepsilon_0/2)\wedge\tilde{T})$, so that $0 \le \theta_1 \le \theta_2 \le 4$, and Lemma 4.11 can be applied. We distinguish the following two cases:

Case 1: $\varepsilon_0/2 \le \tilde{t}$**.** In this case, $\theta_1 = \epsilon_0/2$ and the estimate (4.15) of Lemma 4.5 applies. Lemma 4.11, with (4.14) applied to the p_ϵ outside the integral in the second inequality, yields

$$\begin{aligned} R^d\left|\overline{\boldsymbol{v}(t,\cdot)}^{\psi} - \boldsymbol{c}\right|^2 p_\varepsilon &\le_C p_\varepsilon \iint_{\gamma(\theta_2;4)\setminus(\gamma(\theta_1;4)\cup\gamma(4;1/2))} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2 \tfrac{R^d p_\varepsilon}{\delta_{\underline{\sigma}/4}(\varepsilon+\varepsilon_0/2)} + p_\varepsilon R^{2+d-\frac{2+d}{q}} \\ &\le_C R^d p_\varepsilon \tfrac{1}{\delta_{\underline{\sigma}/4}(\varepsilon+\varepsilon_0/2)} \iint_{\gamma(4,4)\setminus\gamma(4,1/2)} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2 p_\varepsilon + p_\epsilon R^{2+d-\frac{2+d}{q}} \\ &\le_C \tfrac{1}{\delta_{\underline{\sigma}/4}(\varepsilon+\varepsilon_0/2)} \iint_{\gamma(4,4)\setminus\gamma(4,1/2)} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2 p_\varepsilon + R^{2-\frac{2+d}{q}}, \end{aligned}$$

Case 2: $\varepsilon_0/2 > \tilde{t}$**.** Since $\varepsilon_0 \le 1$, we have $\tilde{t} \le 1/2$. Therefore, $(t,x) \in \gamma(1/2,4)\setminus\gamma(1/2,1)$, and, so $x \notin \beta(1)$. Now that its conditions are met, inequlity (4.16) of Lemma 4.5, together with the fact that $\delta_{\overline{\sigma}}$ is bounded from above and Lemma (4.11), implies that

$$R^d\left|\overline{\boldsymbol{v}(t,\cdot)}^{\psi} - \boldsymbol{c}\right| p_\varepsilon \le_C \delta_{\overline{\sigma}}(\varepsilon+\varepsilon_0/2)R^{-d} \iint_{\gamma(4,4)\setminus\gamma(4,1/2)} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2 + R^{2-\frac{2+d}{q}}. \qquad \square$$

Lemma 4.13. *There exists universal constant C such that, for all $\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0/2]$, and all $t \in [t_0, t_0+4R^2]$, we have*

$$\int_D \left|\boldsymbol{v}(t,\cdot) - \overline{\boldsymbol{v}(t,\cdot)}^{\psi}\right|^2 p_\varepsilon \le_C R^2 \int_{D'} |D\boldsymbol{v}(t,\cdot)|^2 \left(\tfrac{p_\varepsilon}{\delta_{\underline{\sigma}/4}(\varepsilon+\varepsilon_0/2)} + \tfrac{\delta_{\overline{\sigma}}(\varepsilon+\varepsilon_0/2)}{R^d}\right),$$

where either $(D,D') = (\beta(2)\setminus\beta(1), \beta(4)\setminus\beta(1/2))$, or $(D,D') = (\beta(2),\beta(4))$.

Proof. We omit the details, since the same strategy as in the proof of Lemma 4.12, namely separating the cases $\tilde{t} \le \varepsilon_0/2$ and $\tilde{t} \ge \varepsilon_0/2$, where $\tilde{t} = (t-t_0)/R^2$, and using the corresponding estimates from Lemma 4.5, but this time together with Lemma 4.9, can be applied. $\square$

Lemma 4.14. *Set $\alpha' = \min(\alpha, 1-\frac{1}{q}(1+\frac{d}{2})) > 0$. There exists a universal constant C such that, for each $\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0/2]$ we have*

$$\iint_{\gamma(1;1/2)} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2 p_\varepsilon \le_C R^{2\alpha'} + \iint_{\gamma(4,4)\setminus\gamma(1,1/2)} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2 \left(\tfrac{p_\varepsilon}{\delta_{\underline{\sigma}/4}(\varepsilon+\varepsilon_0/2)} + \tfrac{\delta_{\overline{\sigma}}(\varepsilon+\varepsilon_0/2)}{R^d}\right). \tag{4.28}$$

Proof. With $\boldsymbol{c} = \overline{v(t_0+\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_0 \wedge \tilde{T})R^2,\cdot)}^{\psi}$, as in Lemma 4.12, we start from the inequality

$$|\boldsymbol{v}(t,x) - \boldsymbol{c}|^2 p_\varepsilon \le 2|\boldsymbol{v}(t,x) - \overline{\boldsymbol{v}(t,\cdot)}^{\psi}|^2 p_\varepsilon + 2|\overline{\boldsymbol{v}(t,\cdot)}^{\psi} - \boldsymbol{c}|^2 p_\varepsilon. \tag{4.29}$$

With $\tilde{t} = (t-t_0)/R^2$, we integrate (4.29) over $D(t) = \beta(2)\setminus\beta(1)$ when $\tilde{t} \in [0,1]$ and over $D(t) = \beta(2)$ when $\tilde{t} \in (1,4]$. Thanks to Lemmas 4.12 and 4.13 we get, for $t \in [t_0, t_0+4R^2]$,

$$\begin{aligned} R^{-2}\int_{D(t)} |\boldsymbol{v}(t,\cdot) - \boldsymbol{c}|^2 p_\varepsilon \le_C \int_{D'(t)} |D\boldsymbol{v}(t,\cdot)|^2 \left(\tfrac{p_\varepsilon(t,\cdot)}{\delta_{\underline{\sigma}/4}(\varepsilon+\varepsilon_0/2)} + \tfrac{\delta_{\overline{\sigma}}(\varepsilon+\varepsilon_0/2)}{R^d}\right) + \\ + R^{-2}\iint_{\gamma(4;4)\setminus\gamma(1;1/2)} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2 \left(\tfrac{p_\varepsilon}{\delta_{\underline{\sigma}/4}(\varepsilon+\varepsilon_0/2)} + \tfrac{\delta_{\overline{\sigma}}(\varepsilon+\varepsilon_0/2)}{R^d}\right) + R^{-\frac{2+d}{q}}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.30}$$

where $D'(t) = \beta(4) \setminus \beta(1/2)$ for $\tilde{t} \in [0,1]$ and $D'(t) = B(4)$, for $\tilde{t} \in (1,4]$. Then we integrate (4.30) over $t \in [t_0, t_0 + 4R^2]$ to obtain

$$R^{-2} \iint\limits_{\gamma(4,2) \setminus \gamma(1,1)} |\boldsymbol{v} - \boldsymbol{c}|^2 \, p_\varepsilon \leq_C \iint\limits_{\gamma(4;4) \setminus \gamma(1;1/2)} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2 \Big(\tfrac{p_\varepsilon}{\delta_{\underline{\sigma}/4}(\varepsilon+\varepsilon_0/2)} + \tfrac{\delta_{\overline{\sigma}}(\varepsilon+\varepsilon_0/2)}{R^d} \Big) + R^{2-\frac{2+d}{q}}. \tag{4.31}$$

Consider, now, the case when $\tilde{T} \leq 4$, i.e., $t_0 \geq T - 4R^2$. Since $\boldsymbol{g}$ is α-Hölder and $\operatorname{supp}\psi \subseteq \beta(4)$, we have $\sup_{\beta(4)} |\boldsymbol{g} - \overline{\boldsymbol{g}}^\psi| \leq \max_{x,x' \in B(4)} |\boldsymbol{g}(x) - \boldsymbol{g}(x')| \leq_C R^\alpha$. This inequality and Lemma 4.11 combined, together with $R \leq 1/4$ together with (4.15) in Lemma 4.5 applied to the last inequality, imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\beta(2)} |\boldsymbol{g} - \boldsymbol{c}|^2 p_\varepsilon(T,\cdot) &\leq \int_{\beta(2)} |\boldsymbol{g} - \overline{\boldsymbol{g}}^\psi|^2 p_\epsilon(T,\cdot) + 2|\overline{\boldsymbol{g}}^\psi - \boldsymbol{c}|^2 \\
&\leq_C R^{2\alpha} + |\overline{\boldsymbol{v}(T,\cdot)}^\psi - \overline{\boldsymbol{v}(t_0 + \varepsilon_0 R^2/2, \cdot)}^\psi|^2 \\
&\leq_C R^{2\alpha} + R^{-d} \iint\limits_{[t_0+\varepsilon_0 R^2/2, T] \times (B(4) \setminus B(1/2))} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2 + R^{2-\frac{d+2}{q}} \\
&\leq_C R^{2\alpha'} + \tfrac{1}{\delta_{\underline{\sigma}/4}(\varepsilon+\varepsilon_0/2)} \iint\limits_{\gamma(4,4) \setminus \gamma(4,1/2)} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2 \, p_\varepsilon.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.32}$$

Finally, we combine the estimates (4.31) and (4.32) with (4.20) (shrinking and extending the domains of integration appropriately) and use $R \leq 1/4$ to obtain (4.28). □

4.5. **Hole-filling.** The following technique is so called "hole-filling" which was first applied to parabolic systems by [Str81]. In the previous subsections, (t_0, x_0) and R are fixed. Now they will be varied in $[0,T] \times B_{n-1}$ and $(0, 1/4]$. It is important to note that none of constants C below depends on (t_0, x_0) and R.

Lemma 4.15. *There exists an universal constant C such that*

$$\sup_{\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0/4]} \iint_{\gamma(1/4;1/2)} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2 \, p_\varepsilon \leq \kappa(\varepsilon_0) \sup_{\varepsilon' \in (0, 16\varepsilon_0]} \iint_{\gamma(16;4)} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2 \, p_{\varepsilon'} + CR^{2\alpha'} \tag{4.33}$$

where $\alpha' = \min(\alpha, 1 - \frac{1}{q}(1 + \frac{d}{2})) > 0$. and $\kappa(\varepsilon) = (1 + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{\underline{\sigma}/4}(\varepsilon))/(1 + \delta_{\underline{\sigma}/4}(\varepsilon))$.

Proof. Inequality (4.15) of Lemma 4.5 yields $p_{\varepsilon_0} \geq_C R^{-d}$ on $\gamma(4;4)$. Given $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0/2]$, this inequality, combined with (4.28), yields

$$\iint\limits_{\gamma(1;1/2)} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2 \, p_\varepsilon \leq_C R^{2\alpha'} + \tfrac{1}{\delta_{\underline{\sigma}/4}(\varepsilon+\varepsilon_0/2)} \iint\limits_{\gamma(4,4) \setminus \gamma(1,1/2)} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2 \, p_\varepsilon + \delta_{\overline{\sigma}}(\varepsilon + \varepsilon_0/2) \iint\limits_{\gamma(4;4)} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2 \, p_{\varepsilon_0}, \tag{4.34}$$

Let C_0 denote the constant C from (4.34); we assume, without loss of generality, that $C_0 \geq 1$. Adding $\frac{C_0}{\delta_{\underline{\sigma}/4}(\varepsilon+\varepsilon_0/2)} \iint_{\gamma(1;1/2)} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2 \, p_\varepsilon$ to both sides of (4.34) and dividing throughout by $1 + \frac{C_0}{\delta_{\underline{\sigma}/4}(\varepsilon+\varepsilon_0/2)}$ yields

$$\iint\limits_{\gamma(1;1/2)} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2 \, p_\varepsilon \leq C_0 R^{2\alpha'} + \kappa'(\varepsilon + \varepsilon_0/2) \Big(\iint\limits_{\gamma(4,4)} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2 \, p_\varepsilon + \iint\limits_{\gamma(4;4)} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2 \, p_{\varepsilon_0} \Big) \tag{4.35}$$

where $\kappa'(\varepsilon) = (1 + \delta_{\underline{\sigma}/4}\delta_{\overline{\sigma}})/(C_0 + \delta_{\underline{\sigma}/4})$. Our choice of the constant ε_0 implies that $\kappa'(\varepsilon) \le \kappa(\varepsilon)$, for $\varepsilon \le \varepsilon_0$. Moreover, κ is strictly decreasing on $[0, \varepsilon_0]$, so $\kappa(\varepsilon_0/2) \ge \kappa(\varepsilon + \varepsilon_0/2)$, for $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0/2]$. Therefore, extending domains on the right-hand side and shrink domains on the left-hand side, we obtain

$$\iint\limits_{\gamma(1/4;\,1/2)} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2\, p_\varepsilon \le \iint\limits_{\gamma(1;\,1/2)} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2\, p_\varepsilon \le C_0 R^{2\alpha'} + \kappa(\varepsilon_0/2) \sup_{\varepsilon' \in (0, 16\varepsilon_0]} \iint_{\gamma(16;4)} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2\, p_{\varepsilon'}.$$

Maximizing over $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0/4]$ on the left-hand side completes the argument. □

Proposition 4.16. *There exists universal constants $C, \alpha_0 > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{R \in (0, 1/4]} R^{-d-2\alpha_0} \iint_{\gamma(1;1)} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2 \le C.$$

Proof. In this proof, we need to vary R and do not consider it fixed, while we still keep (t_0, x_0) fixed. Hence, we include explicit dependence on R in the notation as in, e.g., $\gamma_R(1,1)$. Given $\alpha_0 \in (0, \alpha']$, with α' as in Lemma 4.15, we define

$$\lambda_{\alpha_0}(R) = \sup_{\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]} R^{-2\alpha_0} \iint_{\gamma_R(1,1)} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2\, p(t_0 - \varepsilon R^2, x_0, \cdot, \cdot)$$

Lemma 4.15 implies that there exists a universal constant $C_0 > 0$ such that

$$\lambda_{\alpha_0}(\tfrac{1}{2}R) \le C_0 + \nu(\alpha_0)\, \lambda_{\alpha_0}(4R), \text{ for } R \in (0, 1/4], \tag{4.36}$$

where, with $\kappa < 1$ as in Lemma 4.15, we have $\nu(\alpha_0) = 8^{2\alpha_0}\kappa(\varepsilon_0)$. Choosing $0 < \alpha_0 \le \alpha'$ small enough so that $\nu_0 = \nu(\alpha_0) < 1$, we obtain

$$\lambda_{\alpha_0}(\tfrac{1}{2}R) \le C_0 + \nu_0\, \lambda_{\alpha_0}(4R), \text{ for } R \in (0, 1/4]. \tag{4.37}$$

On the other hand, Proposition 4.7 together with the boundedness of $\boldsymbol{v}$ imply that $\lambda_{\alpha_0}(\cdot)$ is bounded on compact segments of $(0, \infty)$. This and (4.37) combined yield

$$\sup_{R \le 1/4} \lambda_{\alpha_0}(R) \le C_1, \tag{4.38}$$

for some universal constant C_1. The statement then follows from specializing the supremum in the definition of φ to $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0$ and estimating p_{ε_0} using (4.14) of Lemma 4.5. □

The following result finishes the proof of Theorem 2.5.

Corollary 4.17 (Uniform C^α-bounds)**.** *There exists a universal constants C and $\alpha_0 > 0$ such that*

$$[\boldsymbol{v}]_{\alpha_0; B_{n-1}} \le C.$$

Proof. Keeping $(t_0, x_0) \in [0, T] \times B_{n-1}$ and $R \le 1/4$ fixed, we set

$$\boldsymbol{c} = \tfrac{1}{R^2} \int_{t_0}^{t_0 + R^2} \overline{\boldsymbol{v}(t, \cdot)}^{\psi} dt,$$

so that

$$\int_{\beta(1)} |\boldsymbol{v}(t,\cdot) - \boldsymbol{c}|^2 \le_C \int_{\beta(1)} \left|\boldsymbol{v}(t,\cdot) - \overline{\boldsymbol{v}(t,\cdot)}^{\psi}\right|^2 + R^d \left|\overline{\boldsymbol{v}(t,\cdot)}^{\psi} - \boldsymbol{c}\right|^2. \tag{4.39}$$

Applying Lemmas 4.9 and 4.11 to the two terms on the right-hand side respectively, we obtain

$$\int_{\beta(1)} \left|\boldsymbol{v}(t,\cdot) - \overline{\boldsymbol{v}(t,\cdot)}^{\psi}\right|^2 \leq_C R^2 \int_{\beta(4)} |D\boldsymbol{v}(t,\cdot)|^2\,, \text{ and}$$
$$R^d \left|\overline{\boldsymbol{v}(t,\cdot)}^{\psi} - \boldsymbol{c}\right|^2 \leq_C \iint_{\gamma(1;4)} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2 + R^{d+2-\frac{2+d}{q}},$$

so that, an integration of (4.39) over $[t_0, t_0+R^2]$ yields

$$\iint_{\gamma(1;1)} |\boldsymbol{v}-\boldsymbol{c}|^2 \leq_C R^2 \iint_{\gamma(1;4)} |D\boldsymbol{v}|^2 + R^{2+d+(2-\frac{2+d}{q})}.$$

Dividing both sides by $R^{d+2+2\alpha_0}$, where α_0 is from Proposition 4.16, and using the same proposition on the right-hand side, we obtain a universal constant C such that $\iint_{\gamma(1;1)} |\boldsymbol{v}-\boldsymbol{c}|^2 \leq_C R^{d+2+2\alpha_0}$ for all $R \leq 1/4$. Finally, $\boldsymbol{c} = \overline{\boldsymbol{v}}_{\gamma(1;1)}$ minimizes the integral $\iint_{\gamma(1;1)} |\boldsymbol{v}-\boldsymbol{c}|^2$, and, thus, we have

$$\sup_{R\in(0,1/4]} R^{-d-2-2\alpha_0} \iint_{\gamma(1;1)} \left|\boldsymbol{v} - \overline{\boldsymbol{v}}_{\gamma(1;1)}\right|^2 \leq C. \tag{4.40}$$

The constant C of (4.40) above does not depend on $(t_0,x_0) \in [0,T]\times B_{n-1}$, so $\boldsymbol{v}$ belongs to the ball of radius $\sqrt{C}$ in the Campanato space $\hat{C}^{\alpha_0}([0,T]\times B_{n-1})$, where

$$\hat{C}^{\alpha_0}([0,T]\times B_{n-1}) := \Big\{\boldsymbol{v}\in\mathbb{L}^2 : \sup_{(t_0,x_0)\in[0,T]\times B_{n-1}, R\in(0,1/4]} R^{-d-2-2\alpha_0} \iint_{\gamma_{t_0,x_0,R}(1;1)} \left|\boldsymbol{v} - \overline{\boldsymbol{v}}_{\gamma_{t_0,x_0,R}(1;1)}\right|^2 < \infty\Big\}.$$

The (topological) equivalence of the Campanato space $\hat{C}^{\alpha_0}([0,T]\times B_{n-1})$ with the natural metric, and the Hölder spaces $C^{\alpha_0}([0,T]\times B_{n-1})$ (see, e.g., [Lie96, IV.2, p. 49]) implies that $[\boldsymbol{v}]_{\alpha_0;B_{n-1}}$ admits a universal bound. □

5. Additional proofs

5.1. **Proof of Theorem 2.7.** Thanks to our notational convention at the beginning of Section 4, the index m was suppressed in the statement of Corollary 4.17. The dependence on k_n^m is through its $\mathbb{L}^q$-norm on $[0,T]\times B_n$, which is assumed to be bounded uniformly in m. With the conditions (1)-(4) of Theorem 2.5 holding uniformly in m, we have a universal constant C such that $[\boldsymbol{v}_m]_{\alpha_0;B_n} \leq C$, for all m. Combining this uniform Hölder estimate and the uniform bound in condition (2) of Theorem 2.5, we apply Arzelá-Ascoli theorem on $[0,T]\times B_n$ to extract a subsequence of $\{\boldsymbol{v}^m\}$ which converges uniformly. A diagonal procedure then produces another subsequence - still denoted by $\{\boldsymbol{v}^m\}$, as well as a continuous function $\boldsymbol{v} : [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^N$ such that $\boldsymbol{v}^m \to \boldsymbol{v}$, locally uniformly. Thanks to the preservation of Hölder continuity under uniform convergence, the function $\boldsymbol{v}$ belongs to the local Hölder space $C^{\{\alpha'_n\}}$, for some sequence $\{\alpha'_n\}$ in $(0,1]$.

Having picked and fixed $n\in\mathbb{N}$ and the initial condition $(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d$, we set $X = X^{t,x}$ and define the exit time

$$\tau_n = \inf\{u\geq t\,:\, X_u \notin B_n\},$$

as well as the following two sequences of processes

$$\boldsymbol{Y}_u^{(m)} = \boldsymbol{v}^m(u, X_u^{\tau_n}) \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{Z}_u^{(m)} = \boldsymbol{w}^m(u,X_u)\mathbf{1}_{\{u<\tau_n\}}, \quad u\in[t,T].$$

Since $(\boldsymbol{v}^m, \boldsymbol{w}^m)$ is a Markovian solution to the system (2.5), the process $\boldsymbol{Y}^m$ is a semimartingale whose finite-variation part is given by

$$-\int_t^{\cdot} \boldsymbol{f}^m(u, X_u^{\tau_n}, \boldsymbol{Y}_u^{(m)}, \boldsymbol{Z}_u^{(m)}) \mathbf{1}_{\{u\le\tau_n\}}\, du.$$

Condition (3) in Theorem 2.5 and Lemma 4.3 imply that these, finite-variation, parts admit a uniform bound in total variation, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}^{t,x}\int_t^T \Big[\Big|\boldsymbol{f}^m(u, X_u^{\tau_n}, \boldsymbol{Y}_u^{(m)}, \boldsymbol{Z}_u^{(m)})\Big| \mathbf{1}_{\{u\le\tau_n\}}\, du\Big] \le & C(n)\\ \le_{C(n)}\ \mathbb{E}^{t,x}\Big[\int_t^T \Big(\Big|\boldsymbol{Z}_u^{(m)}\Big|^2 + k_n(u, X_u)\Big)\mathbf{1}_{\{X_u\in B_n\}}\, du\Big] \le C(n). & \quad (5.1)\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the uniform convergence of $\boldsymbol{v}^m$ on B_n implies that the convergence $\boldsymbol{Y}^{(m)} \to \boldsymbol{Y}^n = \boldsymbol{v}(\cdot, X^{\tau_n})$ is also uniform.

Uniform ellipticity of σ and Itô's formula applied to $|\boldsymbol{Y}^{(m)} - \boldsymbol{Y}^{(m')}|^2$ yield

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}^{t,x}\Big[\int_t^T \Big|\boldsymbol{Z}_u^{(m)} - \boldsymbol{Z}_u^{(m')}\Big|^2\, du\Big] \le_C & \,||\boldsymbol{Y}_{\tau_n}^{(m)} - \boldsymbol{Y}_{\tau_n}^{(m')}||_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}^2 +\\ & + \Big\| \sup_{u\in[0,\tau_n]} |\boldsymbol{Y}_u^{(m)} - \boldsymbol{Y}_u^{(m')}|\Big\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty} \mathbb{E}^{t,x}\Big[\int_t^T |\boldsymbol{f}_u^m| + \Big|\boldsymbol{f}_u^{m'}\Big|\, du\Big], \quad (5.2)\end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{f}_u^m = \boldsymbol{f}^m(u, X_u^{\tau_n}, \boldsymbol{Y}_u^{(m)}, \boldsymbol{Z}_u^{(m)})\mathbf{1}_{\{u\le\tau_n\}}$ for all $m, m' \in \mathbb{N}$. The uniform bound in (5.1) implies now that the sequence $\{\boldsymbol{Z}^{(m)}\}$ is Cauchy in $\mathbb{L}^2$ uniformly for $(t,x) \in [0,T]\times B_n$, with limit $\boldsymbol{Z}^n$. A subsequence, still labeled $\{\boldsymbol{Z}^{(m)}\}$, converges Leb $\otimes\, \mathbb{P}$-a.e. towards the same limit,

$$\boldsymbol{w}^m(u, X_u)\mathbf{1}_{\{u\le\tau_n\}} \to \boldsymbol{Z}_u^n,$$

uniformly for $(t,x) \in [0,T]\times B_n$. So it follows that

$$\boldsymbol{Z}_u^n = \boldsymbol{Z}_u \mathbf{1}_{\{u\le\tau_n\}}, \text{Leb}\otimes\mathbb{P} - \text{a.s.},$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{Z}_u = \boldsymbol{w}(u, X_u) \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{w}(t', x') = \liminf_m \boldsymbol{w}^m(t', x') \text{ componentwise.}$$

Therefore, by Itô's isometry, for almost all $t' \ge t$ we have

$$\int_t^{\tau_n\wedge t'} \boldsymbol{Z}_u^{(m)}\sigma(u, X_u)\, dW_u \to \int_t^{\tau_n\wedge t'} \boldsymbol{Z}_u\sigma(u, X_u)\, dW_u, \text{ a.s.}$$

Next, we show that

$$\int_t^{\tau_n\wedge t'} \boldsymbol{f}^m(u, X_u, \boldsymbol{Y}_u^{(m)}, \boldsymbol{Z}_u^{(m)})\, du \to \int_t^{\tau_n\wedge t'} \boldsymbol{f}(u, X_u, \boldsymbol{Y}_u, \boldsymbol{Z}_u)\, du, \text{ a.s.} \quad (5.3)$$

as $m\to\infty$, for almost all $t' \ge t$. For that, we first observe that, thank to the assumptions placed on the convergence $\boldsymbol{f}^m \to \boldsymbol{f}$, we have

$$\boldsymbol{f}^m(u, X_u, \boldsymbol{Y}_u^{(m)}, \boldsymbol{Z}_u^{(m)})\mathbf{1}_{\{u\le\tau_n\}} \to \boldsymbol{f}(u, X_u, \boldsymbol{Y}_u\boldsymbol{Z}_u)\mathbf{1}_{\{u\le\tau_n\}}, \lambda\otimes\mathbb{P} - \text{ a.e.}$$

This is, however, enough to ensure the $\lambda \otimes \mathbb{P}$-convergence, which, in turn, implies (5.3). Indeed, we have

$$\left|\boldsymbol{f}^m(u, X_u, \boldsymbol{Y}_u^{(m)}, \boldsymbol{Z}_u^{(m)}) - \boldsymbol{f}(u, X_u, \boldsymbol{Y}_u \boldsymbol{Z}_u)\right| \mathbf{1}_{\{u \le \tau_n\}} \le_C \Big(|\boldsymbol{Z}^m|^2 + |\boldsymbol{Z}|^2 + k_n(t, X_u)\Big) \mathbf{1}_{\{u \le \tau_n\}},$$

with the right-hand side Leb $\otimes \mathbb{P}$-uniformly integrable, thanks to the $\mathbb{L}^2(\text{Leb} \otimes \mathbb{P})$-convergence of $\boldsymbol{Z}^{(m)}$.

It is straightforward now to let $n \to \infty$ and conclude that the pair $(\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{w})$ is a Markovian solution to (2.7). To show that $\boldsymbol{w} = D\boldsymbol{v}$ in the weak sense, we simply note that the proof of Lemma 4.4 applies verbatim.

5.2. **Proof of Theorem 2.8.** We start with part (1) (the bmo-property) and establish a stronger result which will also be used in the proof of uniqueness. For a Borel function $\boldsymbol{w} : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^{N \times d}$, a constant $\delta > 0$, and a compact subset K of $\mathbb{R}^d$, we define its bmo(δ, K)-norm by

$$||\boldsymbol{w}||^2_{\text{bmo}(\delta,K)} = \sup_{t \in [0, T-\delta]} \sup_{x \in K} \mathbb{E}^{t,x}\Big[\int_t^{t+\delta} |\boldsymbol{w}(u, X_u)|^2 \, du\Big].$$

We say that $\boldsymbol{w} \in \text{uBMO}_{loc}$ if $\lim_{\delta \searrow 0} ||\boldsymbol{w}||_{\text{bmo}(\delta,K)} = 0$ for any K; this, stronger, notion of bmo-regularity will play a role in the uniqueness proof below. We start with a well-known estimate whose proof we include for the reader's convenience:

Lemma 5.1. *For all $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$, $t' \in [t, T]$, and $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ we have*

$$\mathbb{E}^{t,x}[|X_{t'} - x|^\alpha] \le C \, (t' - t)^{\alpha/2}, \tag{5.4}$$

where C depends only on α, d, $||b||_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}$ and $||\sigma||_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}$.

Proof. Using the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}^{t,x}[|X_{t'} - x|] \le_C \mathbb{E}^{t,x}\Big[\Big| \int_t^{t'} b(u, X_u) du\Big|\Big] + \mathbb{E}^{t,x}\Big[\Big(\int_t^{t'} |\sigma(u, X_u)|^2 \, du\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big] \le_C (t' - t)^{1/2}.$$

The inequality (5.4) now follows from the fact that $\mathbb{E}^{t,x}[|X_{t'} - x|^\alpha] \le \mathbb{E}^{t,x}[|X_{t'} - x|]^\alpha$. □

Proposition 5.2. *Suppose that, for some $c > 0$, there exists $(h, k) \in \mathbf{Ly}(\boldsymbol{f}, c)$ with $k \in \mathbb{L}^\infty$. Then $\boldsymbol{w} \in$ uBMO$_{loc}$ and $\boldsymbol{w}(\cdot, X) \in$ bmo for any locally Hölderian solution $(\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{w})$ to (2.2) with $||\boldsymbol{v}||_{\mathbb{L}^\infty} \le c$.*

Proof. Given $(h, k) \in \mathbf{Ly}(\boldsymbol{f}, c)$, we apply Itô's formula to $h(\boldsymbol{Y}_u)$, where $\boldsymbol{Y}_u = \boldsymbol{v}(u, X_u)$, between t and t'. With the boundedness of $\boldsymbol{v}$ guaranteeing that the expectations of the local-martingale parts vanish, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}^{t,x}\Big[h(\boldsymbol{v}(t', X_{t'})) - h(\boldsymbol{v}(t, x))\Big] \ge \mathbb{E}^{t,x}\left[\int_t^{t'} |\boldsymbol{w}(u, X_u)|^2 \, du\right] - M(t' - t),$$

where M is an upper bound for k. Boundedness of h on the image of $\boldsymbol{v}$ implies immediately that $w(\cdot, X) \in$ bmo.

To derive a uBMO$_{loc}$-estimate, let L be the Lipschitz constant of the function h on B_c. Recall from Remark 2.6 part (2) that the restriction of a continuous $\boldsymbol{v}$ to each compact subset of $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$

is (uniformly) Hölder-continuous. Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the Markov inequality coupled with Lemma 5.1 imply that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}^{t,x}\Big[h(\boldsymbol{v}(t',X_{t'}))-h(\boldsymbol{v}(t,x))\Big] &\leq L\,\mathbb{E}^{t,x}[|\boldsymbol{v}(t',X_{t'})-\boldsymbol{v}(t,x)|]\\ &\leq_C \mathbb{E}^{t,x}[|\boldsymbol{v}(t',X_{t'})-\boldsymbol{v}(t,x)|\,\mathbf{1}_{|X_{t'}-x|\leq n}]+2||\boldsymbol{v}||_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}\mathbb{P}^{t,x}[|X_{t'}-x|>n]\\ &\leq_C \mathbb{E}^{t,x}[\max(|X_{t'}-x|^{\alpha_n},(t'-t)^{\alpha_n/2})]+(t'-t)^{1/2}\leq_C (t'-t)^{\alpha_n/2},\end{aligned}$$

where the constants C and α_n above can be chosen uniformly for any x in a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$. The statement then follows from combining the two displayed estimates. □

The uniqueness part of the proof is based on a result [Fre14, Proposition 2.1] of Frei, which, in turn extends [Tev08, Proposition 1] from BSDE whose generator does not depend on $\boldsymbol{y}$ and the terminal condition is small in $\mathbb{L}^\infty$-norm, to those whose terminal condition is small in the BMO-norm (see, also, [KP16, Theorem A.1] for a similar result). We now work with $\boldsymbol{f}$ which does not depend on $\boldsymbol{y}$ and derive a consequence of Proposition 5.2 above.

Corollary 5.3. *Let $\boldsymbol{F}:[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d\to\mathbb{R}^N$ be continuous and bounded, and let $\boldsymbol{g}\in C^{\{\alpha_n\}}_{loc}\cap\mathbb{L}^\infty$. The linear system*

$$d\boldsymbol{Y}_t=-\boldsymbol{F}(t,X_t)\,dt+\boldsymbol{Z}_t\sigma_t dW_t,\ \boldsymbol{Y}_T=\boldsymbol{g}(X_T), \tag{5.5}$$

admits a solution $(\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{w})$, which is unique in the class of bounded solutions. Furthermore, this solution is locally Hölderian and $\boldsymbol{w}\in$ uBMO$_{loc}$.

Proof. Let $\{\boldsymbol{f}^m,\boldsymbol{g}^m\}$ be a sequence of smooth approximations obtained by mollification of the functions $\boldsymbol{F}$ and $\boldsymbol{g}$, respectively. This sequence of approximation does not depend on $(\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{z})$ and can be constructed so that $||\boldsymbol{f}^m||_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}+||\boldsymbol{g}^m||_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}\leq 1+||\boldsymbol{F}||_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}+||\boldsymbol{g}||_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}$ for all m, with $\{\boldsymbol{g}^m\}$ bounded in $C^{\{\alpha_n\}}_{loc}$ (cf. Proposition 5.4 below).

Thanks to their boundedness and independence of $\boldsymbol{z}$, these functions are easily seen to satisfy the conditions of Theorem 2.5. In fact, they admit a common c-Lyapunov pair for any c - indeed, it is enough to choose a quadratic h and large-enough constant k. Thanks to the Lipschitz continuity of its coefficients, the equation

$$d\boldsymbol{Y}_t=-\boldsymbol{f}^m(t,X_t,\boldsymbol{Z}_t)\,dt+\boldsymbol{Z}_t\sigma_t dW_t,\quad \boldsymbol{Y}_T=\boldsymbol{g}^m(X_T), \tag{5.6}$$

admits a continuous Markovian solution $(\boldsymbol{v}^m,\boldsymbol{w}^m)$ for each m, with $\{\boldsymbol{v}^m\}$ uniformly bounded. Therefore, by Theorem 2.7, there exists a locally Hölderian solution to (5.5), i.e., a Markovian solution $(\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{w})$ with $\boldsymbol{v}\in C^{\{\alpha'_n\}}_{loc}$.

It is straightforward to see that this solutions is unique in the class of all bounded solutions. Moreover, thanks to the existence of a Lyapunov pair mentioned above, the conditions of Proposition 5.2 are satisfied, and, so, $\boldsymbol{w}\in$ uBMO$_{loc}$. □

To complete the proof of Theorem 2.8, part (2), we pick that we pick two bounded-$\boldsymbol{v}$ continuous solutions $(\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{w})$ and $(\boldsymbol{v}',\boldsymbol{w}')$. By Remark 2.6 part (2), both of them are locally Hölderian - we can assume, without loss of generality, that they both belong to some $C^{\{\alpha_n\}}_{loc}$, with the same exponent sequence $\{\alpha_n\}$. We define $t_0\in[0,T]$ by

$$t_0=\inf\{t\in[0,T]\,:\,\boldsymbol{v}(u,x)=\boldsymbol{v}'(u,x)\text{ for all }x\in\mathbb{R}^d,u\in[t,T]\}.$$

Let us assume - contrary to the conclusion of the theorem - that $t_0 > 0$. When restricted to $[0, t_0]$, both $(\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{w})$ and $(\boldsymbol{v}', \boldsymbol{w}')$ are bounded Markovian solutions to (2.2) with the terminal condition $\boldsymbol{g} = \boldsymbol{v}(t_0, \cdot) = \boldsymbol{v}'(t_0, \cdot)$. They differ, however, on each interval of the form $[t_0 - \delta, t_0]$, $\delta > 0$.

Since $\boldsymbol{f}(\cdot, \cdot, 0)$ is bounded by assumption, we can apply Corollary 5.3 above with $\boldsymbol{F} = \boldsymbol{f}(\cdot, \cdot, 0)$, $\boldsymbol{g} = \boldsymbol{v}(t_0, \cdot)$ to conclude that the pair $(\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{w}})$, which solves the auxiliary equation (5.5) on $[0, t_0]$, has the property that

$$\lim_{t \nearrow t_0} \mathbb{E}^{t,x}\left[\int_t^{t_0} |\tilde{\boldsymbol{w}}(u, X_u)|^2 \, du\right] = 0, \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{5.7}$$

At this point, everything is ready for the application of the aforementioned local uniqueness result of Frei, which we summarize for the reader's convenience: it describes a class of stochastic processes (let us call it $\mathcal{C}$) such that the solutions to (2.2) are unique in $\mathcal{C}$ under the conditions of Theorem 2.8, provided that $\tilde{M}\mathbb{E}^{t,x}[\int_t^{t_0} |\tilde{\boldsymbol{w}}(u, X_u)|^2 du]$ is small enough. Among the members of the class $\mathcal{C}$, as it turns out, are those pairs $(\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{w}})$ for which the quantity

$$\tilde{M}\,\mathbb{E}^{t,x}\Big[\int_t^{t_0} |\hat{\boldsymbol{w}}(u, X_u)\sigma(u, X_u)|^2 \, du\Big]$$

is small enough.

Thanks to (5.7), Frei's result applies when $t \in [0, t_0)$ is chosen close enough to t_0. By making it even closer, if necessary, we can use Proposition 5.2 to make sure that both of our solutions $(\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{w})$ and $(\boldsymbol{v}', \boldsymbol{w}')$ belong to the class $\mathcal{C}$. Therefore, thanks to the fact that X_u has a full support under $\mathbb{P}^{t,x}$ for $u \in (t, t_0]$, we conclude that $\boldsymbol{v}(u, \cdot) = \boldsymbol{v}'(u, \cdot)$ for each $u \in (t, t_0]$ - a contradiction with our definition of t_0. To show that $\boldsymbol{w} = \boldsymbol{w}'$, a.e., we simply appeal to Lemma 4.4 above.

5.3. **Proof of Theorem 2.13.** Our proof of Theorem 2.13 proceeds in two steps. In the first step, we construct a sequence of Lipschitz approximations to the generator $\boldsymbol{f}$ and the terminal condition $\boldsymbol{g}$, making sure there is enough uniformity for the construction of a uniform Lyapunov pair. Next, we observe that those approximation satisfy the condition (AB) or (wAB), producing a uniform, a-priori bound in $\mathbb{L}^\infty$. Lastly, we apply the approximation Theorem 2.5.

5.3.1. *Lipschitz approximations.* We start by outlining a Lipschitz-approximation procedure that will be used in the sequel. We extend slightly the notation for the class of functions satisfying the condition (BF) from Definition 2.9, by including a general, but small, quadratic term; its significance is explained in Remark 2.14 and the additional term corresponds to the 'error' in (2.12). If a function $\boldsymbol{f} : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{N \times d} \to \mathbb{R}^N$ admits the following decomposition

$$\boldsymbol{f}(t, x, \boldsymbol{z}) = \operatorname{diag}(\boldsymbol{z}\mathsf{l}(t, x, \boldsymbol{z})) + \mathsf{q}(t, x, \boldsymbol{z}) + \mathsf{s}(t, x, \boldsymbol{z}) + \mathsf{e}(t, x, \boldsymbol{z}) + \mathsf{k}(t, x), \tag{5.8}$$

where $\mathsf{l}, \mathsf{q}, \mathsf{s}, \mathsf{k}$ satisfy the conditions of Definition 2.9, and for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$|\mathsf{e}(t, x, \boldsymbol{z})| \leq \epsilon_n(1 + |\boldsymbol{z}|^2), \text{ for some } \epsilon_n > 0 \text{ and all } (t, x, \boldsymbol{z}) \in [0, T] \times B_n \times \mathbb{R}^d,$$

then we say that $\boldsymbol{f}$ satisfies the **approximate condition (BF)**, and write $\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbf{BF}_e(\{C_n\}, \{\kappa_n\}, \{q_n\}, \{\varepsilon_n\})$.

As Proposition 5.4 below shows, a pleasant feature of the condition (BF) (and its approximate version) is that it allows for approximation by more regular functions, in a uniform way. More precisely, $\boldsymbol{f}$ can be approximated by a sequence of regular functions $\{\boldsymbol{f}^m\}$, such that, even though the functions $\mathsf{l}, \mathsf{q}, \mathsf{s}, \mathsf{k}$ and e in the decomposition of $\boldsymbol{f}^m$ may depend on m, the constant sequences

$(\{C_n\},\{\kappa_n\},\{q_n\},\{\varepsilon_n\})$ do not. This uniformity is essential to construct a sequence of universal Lyapunov functions $\{h_n\}$ for the approximation sequence $\{\boldsymbol{f}^m\}$.

Proposition 5.4 (Approximations preserving the approximate condition (BF))**.**

(1) For each $\boldsymbol{g} \in C^{\{\alpha_n\}}_{loc}$, then there exists a sequence $\{\boldsymbol{g}^m\}$, bounded in $C^{\{\alpha_n\}}_{loc}$, such that each $\boldsymbol{g}^m$ is Lipschitz (globally in all arguments) and $\boldsymbol{g}^m \to \boldsymbol{g}$ everywhere.

(2) There exists a constant M, which depends only on d and N such that for each $\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbf{BF}_e(\{C_n\},\{\kappa_n\},\{q_n\},\{\varepsilon_n\})$, there exists a sequence $\{\boldsymbol{f}^m\}$ and a subquadratic sequence $\{\kappa'_n\}$ (as in Definition 2.9) such that

(a) $\boldsymbol{f}^m \in \mathbf{BF}_e(MC_n,\kappa'_n,q_n,M\varepsilon_n)$ and is globally Lipschitz in all of its arguments,

(b) $\boldsymbol{f}^m \to \boldsymbol{f}$ pointwise, locally uniformly in $\boldsymbol{z}$, and

(c) $||\boldsymbol{f}^m(\cdot,\cdot,0)||_{\mathbb{L}^{q_n}([0,T]\times B_n)}$ is bounded uniformly in m, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. The idea is to mollify using smooth kernels with a compact support and linearize the tails of the quadratic parts. In this spirit, we define the $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$-function

$$\eta(x) = Ce^{\frac{1}{|x|^2-1}}\mathbf{1}_{|x|<1},$$

with the C is chosen so that $\int \eta(x)dx = 1$. We use the same notation η (and the same formula) for its $C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{N\times d})$ versions.

For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we set $\eta^m(x) = m^d\eta(mx)$ and $\eta^m(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}) = m^{1+d+N\times d}\eta(mt)\eta(mx)\eta(m\boldsymbol{z})$, and use the standard notation for mollification, namely,

$$(\boldsymbol{g} * \eta)(x) = \int \boldsymbol{g}(x-\bar{x})\eta(\bar{x})\,d\bar{x},$$

as well as for its $\eta(t,x,\boldsymbol{z})$-version. We refer the reader to [Eva98, Appendix C.4, Theorem 6] for standard properties of mollification.

We also define the partial-truncation function $\Pi^m(\boldsymbol{w}) = \frac{|\boldsymbol{w}|\wedge m}{|\boldsymbol{w}|}\boldsymbol{w}$, with $\Pi^m(0) = 0$; clearly, Π^m is Lipschitz and $|\Pi^m(\boldsymbol{w})| = |\boldsymbol{w}| \wedge m$. Most of the approximations in this proof will be of the form

$$\boldsymbol{g}^m(x) = (\boldsymbol{g} * \eta^m)(\Pi^m(x))$$

in the $\mathbb{R}^d$ case and

$$\boldsymbol{f}^m(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}) = (\boldsymbol{f} * \eta^m)(t,\Pi^m(x),\Pi^m(\boldsymbol{z})) \tag{5.9}$$

in the $\mathbb{R}^{1+d+N\times d}$-case after extending the domain of $\boldsymbol{f}$ via $\boldsymbol{f}(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}) = \boldsymbol{f}(0,x,\boldsymbol{z})$ for $t < 0$, and $\boldsymbol{f}(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}) = \boldsymbol{f}(T,x,\boldsymbol{z})$ when $t > T$. The same, superscript-m, notation will be used without explicit mention, when this operation is applied to other functions below.

(1) For $\boldsymbol{g} \in C^{\{\alpha_n\}}_{loc}$, one easily checks that each $\boldsymbol{g}^m$ is Lipschitz, the sequence $(\boldsymbol{g}^m)$ is bounded in $C^{\{\alpha_n\}}_{loc}$, and the convergence $\boldsymbol{g}^m \to \boldsymbol{g}$ follows from the standard properties of mollification.

(2) Given a function $\boldsymbol{f}$ satisfying the assumptions in part (2), since the convolution $\boldsymbol{f} * \eta^m$ is smooth, and Π^m is Lipschitz and bounded, each approximation $\boldsymbol{f}^m$ is globally Lipschitz in all of its variables. Furthermore, when $\boldsymbol{z}^m \to \boldsymbol{z}$, we have $\Pi^m(\boldsymbol{z}^m) = \boldsymbol{z}^m$ for sufficiently large m and, so, using the properties that mollifications of a continuous function converge locally uniformly, we have $\boldsymbol{f}^m \to \boldsymbol{f}$ locally uniformly in $\boldsymbol{z}$.

To verify the condition $\mathbf{BF}_e$ for $\boldsymbol{f}^m$, we fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and start with the quadratic-triangular component $\mathbf{q}$. Thanks to the fact that η is of compact support, all components $\mathbf{q}^{m,i}$ of the approximation $\boldsymbol{q}^m$ have the following property

$$|\mathbf{q}^{m,i}(t,x,\boldsymbol{z})| \le C_n(2+\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^i |\boldsymbol{z}^j|^2) \le 2C_n(1+\sum_{j=1}^i |\boldsymbol{z}^j|^2) \text{ on } [0,T]\times B_n \times \mathbb{R}^{N\times d}.$$

Therefore $\mathbf{q}^m$ is quadratic-triangular as well, with $C_n' = 2C_n$. A similar argument can be applied to $\mathbf{e}$. For $\mathbf{k}$, it follows from [Eva98, Appendix C.4, Theorem 6 (iv)] that $\mathbf{k}^m$ converges to $\mathbf{k}$ in $\mathbb{L}^{q_n}([0,T]\times B_n)$ for each n; in particular, the sequence $||\mathbf{k}^m||_{\mathbb{L}^{q_n}([0,T]\times B_n)}$, which differs from $||\boldsymbol{f}^m(\cdot,\cdot,0)||_{\mathbb{L}^{q_n}([0,T]\times B_n)}$ only by a constant, is bounded in m.

For $\mathbf{l}$, a direct approximation of $\mathbf{d}(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}) = \operatorname{diag}(\boldsymbol{z}\mathbf{l}(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}))$ does not produce the function in the same class; it needs an adjustment by a subquadratic term. To see that we note that

$$\mathbf{d}^m(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}) = \operatorname{diag}(\boldsymbol{z}\,\mathbf{l}^m(t,x,\boldsymbol{z})) - \mathbf{L}^m(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}),$$

where $\mathbf{d}^m(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}) = (\mathbf{d}*\eta^m)(t,\Pi^m(x),\Pi^m(\boldsymbol{z}))$ and

$$(\mathbf{L}^i)^m(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}) = \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^d (\mathbf{l}_{ji}*\hat\eta^m_{ij})(t,\Pi^m(x),\Pi^m(\boldsymbol{z})) \text{ and } (\hat\eta^m)_{ij}(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}) = z_{ij}\eta^m(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}).$$

The function $\mathbf{l}^m$ grows at most linearly, with the constant C_n' bounded from above by C_n multiplied by a constant which depends only on d and N. On the other hand, the components of $\mathbf{L}^m$ are mollifications of linearly-growing functions by kernels $\hat\eta^m_{ij}$, all of which are dominated by η^m in absolute value. Therefore, the functions $\mathbf{L}^m$ are of subquadratic growth, uniformly in m.

The subquadratic growth of $\mathbf{s}$ ensures the same property for $\mathbf{s}^m$, uniformly in m, perhaps with a different growth bound κ_n'. Therefore, each $\boldsymbol{f}^m$ admits a decomposition as in (5.8) into the functions $\mathbf{d}^m + \mathbf{L}^m$, $\boldsymbol{q}^m$, $\boldsymbol{s}^m - \mathbf{L}^m$, $\mathbf{e}^m$ and $\mathbf{k}^m$ which have all the required properties. □

5.3.2. *Existence of Lyapunov pairs.* Proposition 5.5 below confirms Proposition 2.10 and Remark 2.14 part (1). Its proof is partially based on a construction in [BF02b, Proposition 3.1, p. 174].

Proposition 5.5. *Let $\{\boldsymbol{f}^m\}$ be a sequence in $\mathbf{BF}_e(\{C_n\},\{\kappa_n\},\{q_n\},\{\varepsilon_n\})$ with $||\boldsymbol{f}^m(\cdot,\cdot,0)||_{\mathbb{L}^{q_n}([0,T]\times B_n)}$ bounded, for each $n\in\mathbb{N}$. Then, for each sequence $\{c_n\}$ of positive numbers, there exists a sequence $\{\bar\varepsilon_n\}$ in $(0,\infty)$ such that if $\varepsilon_n \le \bar\varepsilon_n$ for all n, there exists families $\{h_n\}$ and $\{k_n^m\}$ such that, for each m, $(\{h_n\},\{k_n^m\})$ is a local $\{c_n\}$-Lyapunov pair for $\boldsymbol{f}^m$. In particular, when $\{C_n\},\{\kappa_n\},\{q_n\}$ and $\{\varepsilon_n\}$ are constants in n, there exists a c-Lyapunov pair for $\boldsymbol{f}$, for any $c>0$.*

Proof. We restrict the spatial domain to B_n and suppress the subscript n throughout the proof. When $\{C_n\},\{\kappa_n\},\{q_n\}$ and $\{\varepsilon_n\}$ are constants in n, the spatial domain is $\mathbb{R}^d$. Since $\{\boldsymbol{f}^m\}$ satisfies the approximate condition (BF) with uniform growth sequences $\{C_n\}$, $\{\kappa_n\}$, $\{q_n\}$ and $\{\varepsilon_n\}$, we suppress the superscript m as well. For $\boldsymbol{y}=(y_1,\dots,y_N)\in\mathbb{R}^N$ and $k=1,\dots,N$, we define

$$G_k(\boldsymbol{y}) = \cosh(\alpha_k y_k) \quad \text{and} \quad S_k(\boldsymbol{y}) = \sinh(\alpha_k y_k),$$

with $\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_N>0$ to be determined later. Recursively, we set

$$H_{N+1}=0 \quad \text{and} \quad H_k = \exp(G_k + H_{k+1}), \text{ for } k=1,\dots,N,$$

as well as

$$P_0 = 1, \quad P_k = \textstyle\prod_{i=1}^k H_i, \quad k=1,\dots,N,$$

noting that $1 \le P_1 \le P_2 \le \cdots \le P_N$. With $A_i = \alpha_i S_i P_i$ we compute

$$D_i H_k = A_i P_{k-1}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i \ge k\}},$$

where D_i stands for $\frac{\partial}{\partial y^i}$, so that

$$D_j P_i = P_i \textstyle\sum_{k=1}^{i} (H_k)^{-1} D_j H_k = P_i A_j \sum_{k=1}^{i \wedge j} (P_k)^{-1}.$$

Setting $h = H_1$ and $\tilde{A}_i = \alpha_i^2 G_i P_i$, for $1 \le i, j \le N$, we obtain

$$D_i h = A_i \quad \text{and} \quad D_{ij} h = \tilde{A}_i \mathbf{1}_{\{i=j\}} + A_i A_j \textstyle\sum_{k=1}^{i \wedge j} P_k^{-1}. \tag{5.10}$$

To prove (2.4), we pick an $N \times d$-matrix $\boldsymbol{z}$ and set $\boldsymbol{\zeta}^i = \boldsymbol{z}^i \sigma$ where $\boldsymbol{z}^i$ is the i-th row of $\boldsymbol{z}$, so that $\frac{1}{\Lambda}|\boldsymbol{z}^i|^2 \le |\boldsymbol{\zeta}^i|^2 \le \Lambda |\boldsymbol{z}^i|^2$. Thanks to (5.10), we obtain

$$D^2 h : \langle \boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{z} \rangle_a = \textstyle\sum_{ij} D_{ij} h \, \boldsymbol{\zeta}^i (\boldsymbol{\zeta}^j)^\top = \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{A}_i \left|\boldsymbol{\zeta}^i\right|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N P_i^{-1} \left|\boldsymbol{\eta}_i(\boldsymbol{\zeta})\right|^2,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\eta}^i(\boldsymbol{\zeta}) = \sum_{j=i}^N A_j \boldsymbol{\zeta}^j$.

To deal with the $Dh\boldsymbol{f}$-part in (2.4), we consider various constituents in (2.9) separately. We reuse the letter C for any constant - possibly differing from place to place - which depends only on the sequences $\{C_n\}$ and (κ_n) from statement, or the universal constants.

- *The Quadratic-Linear part:* Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^i$ denote the i-th row of the matrix $\mathbf{l}^\top \sigma^{-1}$, so that

$$\operatorname{diag}(\boldsymbol{z}\mathbf{l})_i = (\boldsymbol{z}\mathbf{l})_{ii} = \boldsymbol{\zeta}^i (\boldsymbol{\lambda}^i)^\top.$$

If we extend the definition of $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\zeta})$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ by setting $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{n+1} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}^0 = \mathbf{0}$, 'summation by parts' implies that

$$\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^N A_i \, \boldsymbol{\zeta}^i (\boldsymbol{\lambda}^i)^\top = \sum_{i=1}^N (\boldsymbol{\eta}^i - \boldsymbol{\eta}^{i+1})(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^i)^\top = \sum_{i=1}^N \boldsymbol{\eta}^i (\boldsymbol{\lambda}^i - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{i-1})^\top.$$

The fact that $|\mathbf{l}| \le C(1 + |\boldsymbol{z}|)$ and Young's inequality yield

$$\begin{aligned} Dh \operatorname{diag}(\boldsymbol{z}\mathbf{l}) = \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^N \boldsymbol{\eta}^i (\boldsymbol{\lambda}^i - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{i-1})^\top &\le \sum_{i=1}^N C \left|\boldsymbol{\eta}^i\right| (1 + |\boldsymbol{\zeta}|) \\ &\le \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^N C P_i (1 + |\boldsymbol{\zeta}|^2) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N P_i^{-1} \left|\boldsymbol{\eta}^i(\boldsymbol{\zeta})\right|^2. \end{aligned}$$

- *The Quadratic-Triangular part:*

$$Dh \, \mathbf{q} = \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^N A_i \mathbf{q}^i \le C \sum_{j=1}^N (1 + |\boldsymbol{\zeta}^j|^2) \sum_{i=j}^N |A_i| \le C \sum_{j=1}^N (1 + |\boldsymbol{\zeta}^j|^2) \sum_{i=j}^N |A_i|.$$

- *Choosing constants* $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_N$*:* The inequality $\sum_{j=1}^N P_i \le N \sum_{j=i}^N P_j$ is valid for each i, so

$$\begin{aligned} &\tfrac{1}{2} D^2 h : \langle \boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{z} \rangle_a - Dh(\operatorname{diag}(\boldsymbol{z}\mathbf{l}) + \mathbf{q}) \\ &\quad \ge \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{1}{2} \tilde{A}_i - C \sum_{j=i}^N (P_j + |A_j|) \right) |\boldsymbol{\zeta}^i|^2 - C \sum_{j=i}^N (P_j + |A_j|) \\ &\quad \ge \textstyle\frac{1}{\Lambda} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{1}{2} \tilde{A}_i - C \sum_{j=i}^N (P_j + |A_j|) \right) |\boldsymbol{z}^i|^2 - C \sum_{j=i}^N (P_j + |A_j|). \end{aligned}$$

The choice $\alpha_N \ge 2C + 1$, together with $G_N \ge 1$ and $|S_N| \le G_N$ yields $\frac{1}{2} \tilde{A}_N > C(P_N + |A_N|)$. For $i \le N - 1$, we have

$$\tfrac{1}{2} \tilde{A}_i - C \textstyle\sum_{j=i}^N (P_j + |A_j|) \ge [\frac{1}{2} \alpha_i^2 - C(1 + \alpha_i)] G_i P_i - \sum_{j=i+1}^N (P_j + |A_j|).$$

Next, we observe the fact that $\sum_{j=i+1}^N (P_j + |A_j|)$ depends only on $\alpha_{i+1}, \ldots, \alpha_N$, and is bounded on the set $[-c, c]^N$ as a function of $y^{i+1}, \ldots, y^N$. Therefore, we can choose a sufficiently large α_i so

that the left-hand side of the previous inequality is positive, and continue this process recursively down to $i = 1$. This way, we obtain a constant C_0, depending on C, c and the universal constants, so that

$$\tfrac{1}{2}D^2h : \langle \boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{z}\rangle_a - Dh(\operatorname{diag}(\boldsymbol{z}\mathbf{l}) + \mathbf{q}) \geq C_0 \left|\boldsymbol{z}\right|^2 - C_0.$$

- *The Subquadratic part:* With $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N$ now fixed, $\sum_i |A_i|$ is bounded on $[-c, c]^N$, as a function of $\boldsymbol{y}$. Therefore $\varepsilon_0 = C_0/\sup_{[-c,c]^N}(\sum_i |A_i|) > 0$. With ε as in (2.12) assumed to be smaller than ε_0, we pick $\varepsilon' < \varepsilon_0 - \varepsilon$ and set

$$\kappa^* = \sup_{\iota \geq 0}(\kappa(\iota) - \varepsilon'\iota).$$

The sublinear growth of κ ensures that κ^* is well-defined in $[0, \infty)$ and

$$Dh\,\mathbf{s} = \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n A_i \mathbf{s}^i \leq \sum_{i=1}^N |A_i|\, \kappa(|\boldsymbol{z}|^2) \leq \frac{C_0}{\varepsilon_0}(\kappa^* + \varepsilon' \left|\boldsymbol{z}\right|^2) = \frac{C_0\varepsilon'}{\varepsilon_0}\left|\boldsymbol{z}\right|^2 + \frac{C_0}{\varepsilon_0}\kappa^*.$$

Lastly, we combine all of the above estimates to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\tfrac{1}{2}D^2h : \langle \boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{z}\rangle_a - Dh\boldsymbol{f} &\geq \tfrac{1}{2}D^2h : \langle \boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{z}\rangle_a - Dh\left(\operatorname{diag}(\boldsymbol{z}\mathbf{l}) + \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{s} + \mathbf{k}\right) - \varepsilon\left|Dh\right|\left|\boldsymbol{z}\right|^2 \\ &\geq \left(C_0\tfrac{\varepsilon_0 - \varepsilon'}{\varepsilon_0} - \varepsilon\left|Dh\right|\right)\left|\boldsymbol{z}\right|^2 - C_0 - C_0\varepsilon_0\kappa^* - Dh\,\mathbf{k}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\varepsilon\left|Dh\right| \leq \varepsilon C_0/\varepsilon_0$, it suffices to define $k = C_0 + C_0\varepsilon_0\kappa^* + C_1\left|\mathbf{k}\right|$, for some $C_1 \geq |Dh|$, and, if necessary, scale both h and ε_0 (yielding $\bar{\varepsilon}$) to make the coefficient in front of $\left|\boldsymbol{z}\right|^2$ equal to 1. □

5.3.3. *Conclusion of the Proof of Theorem 2.13.* Let $\boldsymbol{g}$ and $\boldsymbol{f}$ be two functions which satisfy the conditions of Theorem 2.13, namely $\boldsymbol{g}$ is in $C^{\{\alpha_n\}}_{loc}$ and of subquadratic growth, $\boldsymbol{f}$ satisfies the conditions (AB) and the approximate condition (BF). We start by picking a sequence $(\boldsymbol{f}^m, \boldsymbol{g}^m)$ of Lipschitz approximations constructed in Proposition 5.4. Thanks to the Lipschitz property of all ingredients, each approximate system (2.5) admits a continuous Markovian solution $(\boldsymbol{v}^m, \boldsymbol{w}^m)$ (see, e.g., [EKPQ97, Theorem 4.1 and Corollary 4.1]). Moreover, the Lipschitz approximations $\boldsymbol{f}^m$ satisfy the condition (AB), of Definition 2.11, possibly with the same positively-spanning set $\boldsymbol{a}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{a}_K$, and a possibly different, but m-independent, $\mathbb{L}^1$-function l. The existence of the latter - as the supremum of a family of finer and finer mollifications of an integrable function - is guaranteed by the Hardy-Littlewood maximal theorem. Similarly, the approximations $\boldsymbol{g}^m$ of the terminal condition $\boldsymbol{g}$ satisfy the inequality $|\boldsymbol{g}^m(x)| \leq \zeta(x)$ uniformly in m, for some smooth function ζ with $\lim_{|x|\to\infty}\zeta(x)/\left|x\right|^2 = 0$.

Let $\boldsymbol{a}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{a}_K$ be a positive spanning set from condition (AB). Given $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, we define

$$e^m_k(t, x) = \exp\left(\boldsymbol{a}_k^\top \boldsymbol{v}^m(t, x) - \int_t^T l(s)\, ds\right).$$

A direct computation yields that for each (t, x), the drift term in the $\mathbb{P}^{t,x}$-semimartingale decomposition of the process $e^m_k(\cdot, X)$ is given as the integral of

$$e^m_k(u, X_u)\Big(-\boldsymbol{a}_k^\top \boldsymbol{f}^m(u, X_u, \boldsymbol{Z}^m_u) + l(t) + \tfrac{1}{2}\left|\boldsymbol{a}_k^\top \boldsymbol{Z}^m_u\right|^2\Big),$$

Therefore, by the condition (AB), the process $e^m_k(\cdot, X)$ is a nonnegative local submartingale. Thanks to the boundedness of $\boldsymbol{v}^m$, it is, in fact, a uniformly bounded submartigale and we can use the

Markov property to conclude that

$$e_k^m(t,x) \le \bar{e}(t,x), \qquad \text{where } \bar{e}_k(t,x) := \mathbb{E}^{t,x}[\exp(\boldsymbol{a}_k^\top \mathbf{1}_N \zeta(X_T))],$$

where $\mathbf{1}_N$ denotes the vector of 1s in $\mathbb{R}^N$. Smoothness and the subquadratic growth of ζ imply that the function $\bar{e}_k$ is smooth (see [Fri64, Theorem 12, p. 25]). We then conclude that the sequence $\{e_k^m\}$ - and, therefore, also, $\{\boldsymbol{a}_k^\top \boldsymbol{v}^m\}$ - is bounded from above on compact subsets of $[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d$, uniformly in m. It remains to use the following fact: a sequence $\{\boldsymbol{v}^m\}$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$ for which the sequence $\{\boldsymbol{a}^\top \boldsymbol{v}^m\}$ is bounded from above for each $\boldsymbol{a}$ in some positive spanning set of $\mathbb{R}^N$, is itself bounded in $\mathbb{R}^N$. Indeed, since the i-th canonical base $\mathfrak{e}_i$ for $\mathbb{R}^N$ can be positively spanned by $\mathfrak{e}_i = \lambda_1^i a_1 + \cdots \lambda_K^i a_K$, we have that the i-th component of $\boldsymbol{v}^m$ has the decomposition $\mathfrak{e}_i^\top \boldsymbol{v}^m = \lambda_1^i a_1^\top \boldsymbol{v}^m + \cdots \lambda_K^i a_K^\top \boldsymbol{v}^m$, which is bounded from above uniformly in m. Similarly argument applied to $-\mathfrak{e}_i$ also shows that the i-th component of $\boldsymbol{v}^m$ is bounded from below uniformly in m.

When $\boldsymbol{g}$ is bounded, but only the weaker version (wAB) of the condition (AB) is satisfied, we have from the construction of $\boldsymbol{f}^m$ that

$$\boldsymbol{a}_k^\top \boldsymbol{f}^m(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}) \le l(t) + \tfrac{1}{2}|\boldsymbol{a}_k^\top \boldsymbol{z}|^2 + \boldsymbol{a}_k^\top \boldsymbol{z} \boldsymbol{L}_k^m(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}) - \boldsymbol{a}_k^\top (\boldsymbol{L}_k * \hat{\eta}^m)(t, \Pi^m(x), \Pi^m(\boldsymbol{z})),$$

for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $(t,x) \in [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d$, and $\boldsymbol{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times d}$. Here $\boldsymbol{L}_k^m$ is defined similarly as in (5.9), $\hat{\eta}^m(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}) = \boldsymbol{z}\eta^m(t,x,\boldsymbol{z})$. Since the supp $\eta^m \subseteq B_{1/m}$ and $\boldsymbol{L}_k$ has at most linear growth, there exists a constant C such that

$$\left|\boldsymbol{a}_k^\top (L_k * \hat{\eta}^m)(t, \Pi^m(x), \Pi^m(\boldsymbol{z}))\right| \le_C \tfrac{1}{m}(1 + m \wedge |\boldsymbol{z}|) \le C, \quad \text{for all } m.$$

Combining the previous two estimates, we have

$$\boldsymbol{a}_k^\top \boldsymbol{f}^m(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}) \le l(t) + \tfrac{1}{2}|\boldsymbol{a}_k^\top \boldsymbol{z}|^2 + \boldsymbol{a}_k^\top \boldsymbol{z} \boldsymbol{L}_k^m(t,x,\boldsymbol{z}),$$

for a different $l \in \mathbb{L}^1[0,T]$.

Argue as before that the drift of the process $e_k^m(\cdot, X)$ is given as the integral of

$$e_k^m(u,X_u)\Big(p_k^m(u,X_u) + \boldsymbol{a}_k^\top \boldsymbol{Z}_u^m \boldsymbol{L}_k^m(u,X_u,\boldsymbol{Z}_u^m)\Big),$$

for some functions $p_k^m \ge 0$, while its martingale-part admits the dW-integrand of the form

$$e_k^m(u,X_u)\, \boldsymbol{a}_k^\top \boldsymbol{Z}_u^m.$$

Boundedness of e_k^m and $\boldsymbol{L}_k^m$ allows us to conclude that $e_k^m(\cdot,X)$ is a submartingale under an equivalent measure (given as the Girsanov transformation with drift $\boldsymbol{L}_k^m$), with the terminal value bounded uniformly in m. The rest is as before, and leads to a similar conclusion, except that now the boundedness is uniform in (t,x).

Moreover, using only the function l and the positive spanning set $\boldsymbol{a}_1,\ldots,\boldsymbol{a}_K$ of condition (wAB), we well as the $\mathbb{L}^\infty$-bounds on $\boldsymbol{g}$, one can produce an a-priori bound c on $\{\boldsymbol{v}^m\}$. This way we obtain a sequence - namely $\{c_n\}$ with each $c_n = c$ - independently of the other constants $\{C_n\}$, $\{q_n\}$ and $\{\kappa_n\}$ appearing in the approximate condition (BF). This way, we can avoid circularity in the definition the sequence $\{\bar{\varepsilon}_n\}$ of Proposition 5.5, that enforces the 'smallness' condition on the 'error' term in the (BF)-decomposition of $\boldsymbol{f}$.

Whether $\boldsymbol{g}$ is bounded or unbounded, we have produced a sequence $\{c_n\}$ of a-priori bounds that can be used together with the sequences $\{\boldsymbol{f}^m\}$ and $\{\boldsymbol{g}^m\}$ in Proposition 5.5 to construct local

$\{c_n\}$-Lyapunov pairs $\{h_n, k_n^m\}$ for $\boldsymbol{f}^m$ with uniformly $\mathbb{L}^{q_n}$-bounded k-parts. By Theorem 2.7, this is enough to guarantee the existence of locally Hölderian solution $(\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{w})$.

To establish uniqueness, we note that the sequence $\{k_n^m\}$ from Proposition 5.5 will be constant (both in n and m) under the condition (a) of Theorem 2.13. Moreover, due to the absence of dependence on n in (b), a c-Lyapunov pair (h, k) with constant k can be constructed for any c. The fact that any bounded continuous solution is a-priori bounded by the constant c constructed above, together with the local Lipschitz condition in (c), is enough to apply the abstract uniqueness result Theorem 2.8, part (2).

5.4. **Proofs for examples.**

5.4.1. *Proof of Theorem 3.1.* Consider the following system of BSDE

$$d\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t = \tilde{\boldsymbol{f}}(t, X_t, \tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t)\, dt + \tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t \sigma(t, X_t)\, dW_t, \quad \tilde{Y}_T = \boldsymbol{g}(X_T), \tag{5.11}$$

where

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{f}}(t, x, \tilde{\boldsymbol{z}}) = \boldsymbol{f}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{z}}\sigma(t, x)) \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{z}) = -\tfrac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\nu}^2 + \tfrac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{A}[\boldsymbol{\mu}]^2 - \boldsymbol{A}[\boldsymbol{\mu}]\boldsymbol{\mu} \quad \text{with } \boldsymbol{z} = (\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\nu}).$$

We will use Theorem 2.13 to establish the existence of a Höldearian solution $(\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{w}})$. Then $(\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{w}}\sigma)$ is a Höldearian solution of (3.1).

Let us first verify the condition (AB). Let σ_i, $i = 1, 2$, be the i-th column vector of σ. Denote $\tilde{\mu} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{z}}\sigma_1$ and $\tilde{\nu} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{z}}\sigma_2$. Then

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{f}} = -\tfrac{1}{2}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}^2 + \tfrac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{A}[\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}]^2 - \boldsymbol{A}[\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}]\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}.$$

Let $(\mathfrak{e}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{e}_N)$ be the standard Euclidean basis of $\mathbb{R}^N$, and $\boldsymbol{a}_{N+1} = (\alpha^1, \dots, \alpha^N)$ where the sequence of constants $\{\alpha^i\}$ appears after (3.1). Then the set $(-\mathfrak{e}_1, \dots, -\mathfrak{e}_N, \boldsymbol{a}_{N+1})$ positively span $\mathbb{R}^N$. Moreover,

$$-\mathfrak{e}_i^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{f}} \le \tfrac{1}{2}(\tilde{\mu}^i)^2 + \tfrac{1}{2}(\tilde{\nu}^i)^2 \quad \text{for } 1 \le i \le N \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{a}_{N+1}^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{f}} = -\tfrac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{A}[\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}^2] - \tfrac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{A}[\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}]^2 \le 0.$$

In order to verify the condition (BF), let us introduce an invertible linear transformation on $\mathbb{R}^N$ via

$$\overline{Y}^i = \tilde{Y}^i - \tilde{Y}^N, \quad i = 1, \cdots, N-1, \quad \overline{Y}^N = \tilde{Y}^N, \tag{5.12}$$

and $\overline{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \overline{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$, and $\overline{\boldsymbol{g}}$ in a similar manner. A simple calculation reveals the dynamics of $\overline{\boldsymbol{Y}}$ as

$$d\overline{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t = \overline{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_t dB_t + \overline{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_t dB_t^\perp - \overline{\boldsymbol{f}}(\overline{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_t, \overline{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_t)\, dt, \quad \overline{\boldsymbol{Y}}_T = \overline{\boldsymbol{g}}(B_T, W_T),$$

where $\overline{\boldsymbol{f}}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{f}^i &= -\tfrac{1}{2}\overline{\nu}^i(\overline{\nu}^i + 2\overline{\nu}^N) - \overline{\mu}^i\Big(\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \alpha^j \overline{\mu}^j + \overline{\mu}^N\Big), \quad i = 1, \dots, N-1, \text{ and} \\
\overline{f}^N &= -\tfrac{1}{2}(\overline{\nu}^N)^2 + \tfrac{1}{2}\Big(\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \alpha^j \overline{\mu}^j + \overline{\mu}^N\Big)^2 - \overline{\mu}^N\Big(\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \alpha^j \overline{\mu}^j + \overline{\mu}^N\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Using this, explicit, expression, one easily checks that $\overline{\boldsymbol{f}}$ satisfies the condition (BF) of Definition 2.9. On the other hand, since $\tilde{\boldsymbol{f}}$ already satisfies the condition (AB), after the linear transformation of $\mathbb{R}^N$, $\overline{\boldsymbol{f}}$ satisfies (AB) as well (cf. Remark 2.12). Therefore the existence and uniqueness of a bounded continuous solution to (5.12) (hence (5.11) and (3.1)) follows from Theorem 2.13. Finally, when the terminal condition is bounded, combining Theorem 2.8 part (1) and [KXŽ15, Theorem 1.6 (2)→(1)], we confirm the existence of an equilibrium. Conversely any equilibrium

with continuous certainty equivalence functions corresponds to a continuous Markovian solution of (3.1), which is already proven to be unique.

5.4.2. *Proof of Proposition 3.4.* We define the approximated driver $\boldsymbol{f}^m$ by

$$(\boldsymbol{f}^m(\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{z}))^k = \tfrac{1}{2}\textstyle\sum_{i,j}\Gamma^k_{ij}(\boldsymbol{y})\Big(\Pi^m(\boldsymbol{z})^\top\Pi^m(\boldsymbol{z})\Big)_{ij},\ \text{for } \boldsymbol{y}\in\mathbb{R}^N,\ \boldsymbol{z}\in\mathbb{R}^{N\times d},$$

where $\Pi^m(\boldsymbol{z}) = \frac{|\boldsymbol{z}|\wedge m}{|\boldsymbol{z}|}\boldsymbol{z}$ for $m\in\mathbb{N}$. Also, we construct a sequence $(\boldsymbol{g}^m)$ of Lipschitz approximation of $\boldsymbol{g}$ as in Proposition 5.4. Mollification does not increase the $\mathbb{L}^\infty$-norm and the set sublevel set $M_0 = \phi^{-1}((-\infty,0])$ is convex; therefore, the images of all $\boldsymbol{g}^m$ remain inside M_0, i.e., $\phi^{-1}(\boldsymbol{g}^m(x))\le 0$, for all x and m.

The globally-Lipschitz structure of its ingredients implies that the approximated system

$$d\boldsymbol{Y}^m_t = -\boldsymbol{f}^m(\boldsymbol{Y}^m_t,\boldsymbol{Z}^m_t)\,dt + \boldsymbol{Z}^m_t\,dW_t,\quad \boldsymbol{Y}^m_T = \boldsymbol{g}^m(W_T)$$

admits a unique Hölderian solution $(\boldsymbol{v}^m,\boldsymbol{w}^m)$. To show that the sequence $\{\boldsymbol{v}^m\}$ is uniformly bounded, more precisely, that $\boldsymbol{v}^m\in M_0$ for all m, we define the stopping time $\tau = \inf\{s\ge t : \phi(\boldsymbol{Y}^m_s)\le\varepsilon\}\wedge T$, for given $t\in[0,T]$ and $\varepsilon>0$. By Itô's formula, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_t[\phi(\boldsymbol{Y}^m(\tau))] - \phi(\boldsymbol{Y}^m_t) = \\
&\quad= \mathbb{E}_t\Big[\int_t^\tau \tfrac{1}{2}D^2\phi(\boldsymbol{Y}^m_s) : (\boldsymbol{Z}^m_s)^\top\boldsymbol{Z}^m_s - \tfrac{1}{2}D\phi(\boldsymbol{Y}^m_s)\Gamma(\boldsymbol{Y}^m_s)\Pi^m(\boldsymbol{Z}^m_s)^\top\Pi^m(\boldsymbol{Z}^m_s)\,ds\Big] \\
&\quad= \tfrac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_t\left[\int_t^\tau \Big(\mathrm{Hess}\,\phi(\Pi^m(\boldsymbol{Z}^m_s),\Pi^m(\boldsymbol{Z}^m_s)) + \tfrac{1}{2}\tfrac{|\boldsymbol{Z}_s|-|\boldsymbol{Z}_s|\wedge m}{|\boldsymbol{Z}_s|}D^2\phi(\boldsymbol{Y}^m_s)(\boldsymbol{Z}^m_s)^\top\boldsymbol{Z}^m_s\Big)\,ds\right],
\end{aligned}$$

where the local martingale term can be dealt with by stopping, using the fact that $D\phi$ is bounded on compacts and $\boldsymbol{Z}^m\in H^2$. Double convexity of ϕ implies that both terms inside the expectation above are nonnegative, so that

$$\phi(\boldsymbol{Y}^m_t)\le\mathbb{E}_t[\phi(\boldsymbol{Y}^m_\tau)],\ \text{a.s.}$$

Since $\phi(\boldsymbol{Y}^m_T)\le 0<\varepsilon$ the stopping time τ gets realized strictly before T. Therefore, the right-hand side above is bounded from above by ε, immediately implying that $\phi(\boldsymbol{Y}^m_t)\le\varepsilon$, a.s., and establishing the claim about boundedness of $\boldsymbol{v}^m$.

Once the a-priori boundedness of the approximating sequence $\{\boldsymbol{v}^m\}$ is established, we can use the strict geodesic convexity of ϕ on some neighborhood of M_0 to conclude that ϕ can be suitably redefined on a complement of a neighborhood of M_0 to serve, together with $k=0$, as a c-Lyapunov pair, for large enough c. Then the existence of a locally Hölderian solution to (3.2), with $\boldsymbol{Y}_T = \boldsymbol{g}(W_T)$, readily follows from Theorem 2.7.

5.4.3. *Proof of Proposition 3.6.* Let us first argue that a solution $(\boldsymbol{Y},\boldsymbol{Z})$ with $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\boldsymbol{Z}),\hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(\boldsymbol{Z}))\in\text{bmo}^2$ to (3.5) corresponds to a Nash equilibrium. For a given $\boldsymbol{\mu}\in\text{bmo}$, we consider the process

$$\tilde{Y}^1_t = \mathbb{E}^{\mu,\hat{\nu}}_t\Big[\int_t^T\Big(h^1(X_u) + \tfrac{1}{2}|\boldsymbol{\mu}_u|^2 + \theta\boldsymbol{\mu}_u^\top\hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_u\Big)\,du + g^1(X_T)\Big].$$

Thanks to the fact that h^1 and g^1 are both bounded and $\boldsymbol{\mu},\hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\in\text{bmo}$, $\tilde{Y}^1$ is bounded. Since X generates the same filtration as W, the martingale representation implies the existence of a process

$\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}^1 \in \mathcal{P}^2$ such that

$$\tilde{Y}_t^1 = g^1(X_T) + \int_t^T \left(h^1(X_u) + \tfrac{1}{2}|\boldsymbol{\mu}_u|^2 + \theta \boldsymbol{\mu}_u^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_u\right) du - \int_t^T \tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_u^1 \, dW_u^{\mu,\hat{\nu}}.$$

If we subtract the corresponding component Y^1 of the solution $\boldsymbol{Y}$ of (3.5) from it, we obtain

$$\tilde{Y}_0^1 - Y_0^1 = \int_0^T (L^1(\boldsymbol{\mu}_u, \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_u, \boldsymbol{Z}_u) - L^1(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_u, \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_u, \boldsymbol{Z}_u)) \, du - \int_0^T (\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_u^1 - \boldsymbol{Z}_u^1) \, dW_u^{\mu,\hat{\nu}}.$$

Since $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ is the minimizer of $L^1(\cdot, \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}, \boldsymbol{Z})$, and both Y^1 and $\tilde{Y}^1$ are bounded, a localization argument yields $\tilde{Y}_0^1 \geq \hat{Y}_0^1$, confirming the first inequality in (3.3). A similar argument applies to the cost of the second player as well.

For the existence and uniqueness of $(\boldsymbol{Y}, \boldsymbol{Z})$, we verify all conditions in Theorem 2.13. Introduce an invertible linear transformation on $\mathbb{R}^2$ via $\tilde{y}^1 = y^1 - y^2$ and $\tilde{y}^2 = y^2$. Define $\tilde{\boldsymbol{z}}$, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{g}}$ similarly, and consider the BSDE

$$d\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}_t = -\tilde{\boldsymbol{f}}(X_t, \tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t) \, dt + \tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_t \, dW_t, \quad \tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}_T = \tilde{\boldsymbol{g}}(X_T), \tag{5.13}$$

where

$$\tilde{f}^1(x, \tilde{\boldsymbol{z}}) = \tfrac{2\theta-1}{2(1+\theta)(1-\theta)} \tilde{\boldsymbol{z}}^1 \cdot (\tilde{\boldsymbol{z}}^1 + 2\tilde{\boldsymbol{z}}^2) + h^1(x) - h^2(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{f}^2 = f^2.$$

Using this explicit expression, one easily checks that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{f}}$ satisfies the condition (BF).

Next we show that $\boldsymbol{f}$ satisfies the condition (wAB), hence $\tilde{\boldsymbol{f}}$ satisfies the same condition as well. To this end, calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} L^1(\boldsymbol{z}) &= -\tfrac{\theta^2}{2(1+\theta)^2(1-\theta)^2}|\boldsymbol{z}^1 + \boldsymbol{z}^2|^2 - \tfrac{1-2\theta}{2(1-\theta)^2(1+\theta)} \boldsymbol{z}^1 \cdot ((1-\theta)\boldsymbol{z}^1 + 2\boldsymbol{z}^2) \\ &\leq -\tfrac{1-2\theta}{2(1-\theta)^2(1+\theta)} \boldsymbol{z}^1 \cdot ((1-\theta)\boldsymbol{z}^1 + 2\boldsymbol{z}^2). \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

A similar inequality holds for $L^2(\boldsymbol{z})$. Therefore using the fact that $\boldsymbol{h}$ is bounded, we obtain functions $\boldsymbol{L}_i$ such that $\mathfrak{e}_i^\top \boldsymbol{f} \leq h^i + \mathfrak{e}_i^\top \boldsymbol{z} \boldsymbol{L}_i$ for $i = 1, 2$.

When $\theta \leq 1/2$, using the first identity above, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} L^1(\boldsymbol{z}) + L^2(\boldsymbol{z}) &= \tfrac{\theta^2+\theta-1}{(1+\theta)^2(1-\theta)^2}|\boldsymbol{z}^1 + \boldsymbol{z}^2|^2 + \tfrac{1-2\theta}{2(1-\theta)^2}(|\boldsymbol{z}^1|^2 + |\boldsymbol{z}^2|^2) \\ &\geq \tfrac{\theta^2+\theta-1}{(1+\theta)^2(1-\theta)^2}|\boldsymbol{z}^1 + \boldsymbol{z}^2|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $\boldsymbol{a}_3 = (-1, -1)$, we have

$$\boldsymbol{a}_3^\top \boldsymbol{f} \leq 2\|h^1 + h^2\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty} + \tfrac{|\theta^2+\theta-1|}{(1+\theta)^2(1-\theta)^2}|\boldsymbol{z}^1 + \boldsymbol{z}^2|^2.$$

As a result, $\boldsymbol{f}$ satisfies the condition (wAB) with the positively spanning set $(\mathfrak{e}_1, \mathfrak{e}_2, \boldsymbol{a}_3)$.

When $\theta > 1$, consider $\boldsymbol{a}_3 = (-\theta, 1)$ and $\boldsymbol{a}_4 = (1, -\theta)$. We have from (3.4) that

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \tfrac{1}{(1-\theta)(1+\theta)}(\theta \boldsymbol{z}^2 - \boldsymbol{z}^1) = \tfrac{1}{(\theta-1)(1+\theta)} \boldsymbol{a}_4^\top \boldsymbol{z} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}} = \tfrac{1}{(1-\theta)(1+\theta)}(\theta \boldsymbol{z}^1 - \boldsymbol{z}^2) = \tfrac{1}{(\theta-1)(1+\theta)} \boldsymbol{a}_3^\top \boldsymbol{z}.$$

On the other hand, for $\theta > 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{a}_3^\top \boldsymbol{L} &= -\theta L^1 + L^2 = -\tfrac{\theta}{2}|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}|^2 + (\tfrac{1}{2} - \theta)|\hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}|^2 + (2\theta - 1)\hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}^\top (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \tfrac{\theta+2}{2}\hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) \\ &\leq \tfrac{2\theta-1}{(\theta-1)^2(1+\theta)^2} (\boldsymbol{a}_3^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{z}})^\top (\tfrac{\theta+2}{2}\boldsymbol{a}_3 + \boldsymbol{a}_4)^\top \boldsymbol{z}. \end{aligned}$$

A similar inequality holds for $\boldsymbol{a}_4^\top \boldsymbol{L}$. Combining the previous two estimates together with boundedness of $\boldsymbol{h}$, we confirm that $\boldsymbol{f}$ satisfies the condition (wAB) with the set of vectors $(\mathfrak{e}_1, \mathfrak{e}_2, \boldsymbol{a}_3, \boldsymbol{a}_4)$, which positively span $\mathbb{R}^2$ when $\theta > 1$.

Finally we conclude from Theorem 2.13 that the system (5.13) (hence (3.5)) admits a unique bounded continuous solution.

5.4.4. *Proof of Proposition 3.7.* It is clear that the generator of system (3.6) satisfies the condition (BF) and (wAB) when $\boldsymbol{g}$ is bounded ((AB) when $\boldsymbol{g}$ is unbounded). Then the existence (and uniqueness for bounded $\boldsymbol{g}$) readily follows from Theorem 2.13. Given the bounded continuous solution, $\boldsymbol{Z} = \boldsymbol{w}(\cdot, X) \in \text{bmo}$, hence [EKH03, Proposition 5.1] concludes that $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}})$ is a Nash equilibrium with value $(\exp(v^1), \exp(v^2))$.

REFERENCES

[Aro67] D. G. Aronson, *Bounds for the fundamental solution of a parabolic equation*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **73** (1967), 890–896.

[Aub98] T. Aubin, *Some nonlinear problems in Riemannian geometry*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.

[BE13] P. Briand and R. Elie, *A simple constructive approach to quadratic BSDEs with or without delay*, Stochastic Process. Appl. **123** (2013), 604–618.

[BEK13] P. Barrieu and N. El Karoui, *Monotone stability of quadratic semimartingales with applications to unbounded general quadratic BSDEs*, Ann. Probab. **41** (2013), 1831–2853.

[BF00] A. Bensoussan and J. Frehse, *Stochastic games for N players*, J. Optim. Theory Appl. **105** (2000), no. 3, 543–565, Special Issue in honor of Professor David G. Luenberger.

[BF02a] ———, *Regularity results for nonlinear elliptic systems and applications*, Applied Mathematical Sciences, vol. 151, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2002.

[BF02b] ———, *Smooth solutions of systems of quasilinear parabolic equations*, ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var. **8** (2002), 169–193.

[BH06] P. Briand and Y. Hu, *BSDE with quadratic growth and unbounded terminal value*, Probab. Theory and Related Fields **136** (2006), 604–618.

[BH08] ———, *Quadratic BSDEs with convex generators and unbounded terminal conditions*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **141** (2008), no. 3-4, 543–567.

[Bis73] J.-M. Bismut, *Conjugate convex functions in optimal stochastic control*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **44** (1973), 384–404.

[BL97] G. Barles and E. Lesigne, *SDE, BSDE and PDE*, Backward stochastic differential equations (Paris, 1995–1996), Pitman Res. Notes Math. Ser., vol. 364, Longman, Harlow, 1997, pp. 47–80.

[Bla05] F. Blache, *Backward stochastic differential equations on manifolds*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **132** (2005), no. 3, 391–437.

[Bla06] ———, *Backward stochastic differential equations on manifolds. II*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **136** (2006), no. 2, 234–262.

[BM01] V. Bally and A. Matoussi, *Weak solutions for SPDEs and backward doubly stochastic differential equations*, J. Theoret. Probab. **14** (2001), no. 1, 125–164.

[CD15] U. Cetin and A. Danilova, *Markovian nash equilibrium in financial markets with asymmetric information and related forward-backward systems*, to appear in Ann. App. Prob., 2015.

[CDY92] K.-C. Chang, W. Y. Ding, and R. Ye, *Finite-time blow-up of the heat flow of harmonic maps from surfaces*, J. Differential Geom. **36** (1992), no. 2, 507–515.

[CHKP14] P. Cheridito, U. Horst, M. Kupper, and T. A. Pirvu, *Equilibrium pricing in incomplete markets under translation invariant preferences*, to appear in Math. Oper. Res., 2014.

[CL15] J.H. Choi and K. Larsen, *Taylor approximation of incomplete Radner equilibrium models*, Finance Stoch. **19** (2015), no. 3, 653–679.

[CM97] R. Chitashvili and M. Mania, *On functions transforming a Wiener process into a semimartingale*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **109** (1997), no. 1, 57–76.

[CN14] P. Cheridito and K. Nam, *BSDEs with terminal conditions that have bounded Malliavin derivative*, J. Funct. Anal. **266** (2014), no. 3, 1257–1285.

[CN15] ———, *Multidimensional quadratic and subquadratic BSDEs with special structure*, to appear in Stochastics, 2015.

[Dar95] R.W. Darling, *Constructing Gamma-martingale with prescribed limit, using backward SDE*, Ann. Probab. **23** (1995), no. 3, 1234–1261.

[Dav54] C. Davis, *Theory of positive linear dependence*, Amer. J. Math. **76** (1954), 733–746.

[DHB11] F. Delbaen, Y. Hu, and X. Bao, *Backward SDEs with superquadratic growth*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **150** (2011), no. 1-2, 145–192.

[EKH03] N. El Karoui and S. Hamadène, *BSDEs and risk-sensitive control, zero-sum and nonzero-sum game problems of stochastic functional differential equations*, Stochastic Process. Appl. **107** (2003), no. 1, 145–169.

[EKPQ97] N. El Karoui, S. Peng, and M. C. Quenez, *Backward stochastic differential equations in finance*, Math. Finance **7** (1997), no. 1, 1–71.

[Éme89] M. Émery, *Stochastic calculus in manifolds*, Universitext, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989, With an appendix by P.-A. Meyer.

[ES64] J. Eells and J. H. Sampson, *Harmonic mappings of Riemannian manifolds*, Amer. J. Math. **86** (1964), 109–160.

[ET15] G.-E. Espinosa and N. Touzi, *Optimal investment under relative performance concerns*, Math. Finance **25** (2015), no. 2, 221–257.

[Eva98] L. C. Evans, *Partial differential equations*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 19, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1998.

[FdR11] C. Frei and G. dos Reis, *A financial market with interacting investors: does an equilibrium exist?*, Math. Financ. Econ. **4** (2011), no. 3, 161–182.

[Fre14] C. Frei, *Splitting multidimensional BSDEs and finding local equilibria*, Stochastic Process. Appl. **124** (2014), 2654–2671.

[Fri64] A. Friedman, *Partial differential equations of parabolic type*, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964.

[HP06] Y. Hu and S. Peng, *On the comparison theorem for multidimensional BSDEs*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **343** (2006), no. 2, 135–140.

[Hsu02] E. P. Hsu, *Stochastic analysis on manifolds*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 38, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002.

[HT15] Y. Hu and S. Tang, *Multi-dimensional backward stochastic differential equations of diagonally quadratic generators*, to appear in Stochastic Process. Appl., 2015.

[IKO62] A. M. Il′in, A. S. Kalašnikov, and O. A. Oleĭnik, *Second-order linear equations of parabolic type*, Russian Math. Surveys **17** (1962), no. 3 (105), 3–146.

[Joh78] F. John, *Partial differential equations*, third ed., Applied Mathematical Sciences, vol. 1, Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1978.

[Ken90] W. S. Kendall, *Probability, convexity, and harmonic maps with small image. I. Uniqueness and fine existence*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **61** (1990), no. 2, 371–406.

[Kob00] M. Kobylanski, *Backward stochastic differential equations and partial differential equations with quadratic growth*, Ann. Probab. **28** (2000), no. 2, 558–602.

[KP16] D. Kramkov and S. Pulido, *A system of quadratic BSDEs arising in a price impact model*, To appear in Ann. Appl. Probab., 2016.

[KXŽ15] C. Kardaras, H. Xing, and Žitković, *Incomplete stochastic equilibria with exponential utilities: close to Pareto optimality*, Working paper, 2015.

[Lej02] A. Lejay, *BSDE driven by Dirichlet process and semi-linear parabolic PDE. Application to homogenization*, Stochastic Process. Appl. **97** (2002), no. 1, 1–39.

[Lie96] G. M. Lieberman, *Second order parabolic differential equations*, World Scientific Publishing Co. Inc., River Edge, NJ, 1996.

[LSM97] J. P. Lepeltier and J. San Martin, *Backward stochastic differential equations with continuous coefficient*, Statist. Probab. Lett. **32** (1997), no. 4, 425–430.

[MX08] A. Matoussi and M. Xu, *Sobolev solution for semilinear PDE with obstacle under monotonicity condition*, Electron. J. Probab. **13** (2008), no. 35, 1035–1067.

[Pen99] S. Peng, *Open problems on backward stochastic differential equations*, Control of distributed parameter and stochastic systems (Hangzhou, 1998), Kluwer Acad. Publ., Boston, MA, 1999, pp. 265–273.

[PP90] É. Pardoux and S. Peng, *Adapted solution of a backward stochastic differential equation*, Systems Control Lett. **14** (1990), no. 1, 55–61.

[PP92] ———, *Backward stochastic differential equations and quasilinear parabolic partial differential equations*, Stochastic partial differential equations and their applications (Charlotte, NC, 1991), Lecture Notes in Control and Inform. Sci., vol. 176, Springer, Berlin, 1992, pp. 200–217.

[Str81] M. Struwe, *On the Hölder continuity of bounded weak solutions of quasilinear parabolic systems*, Manuscripta Math. **35** (1981), no. 1-2, 125–145.

[Sub91] A. Subrahmanyam, *Risk aversion, market liquidity, and price efficiency*, Rev. Financ. Stud. **4** (1991), no. 3, 417– 441.

[SV06] D. W. Stroock and S. R. S. Varadhan, *Multidimensional diffusion processes*, Classics in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006, Reprint of the 1997 edition.

[Tan03] S. Tang, *General linear quadratic optimal stochastic control problems with random coefficients: linear stochastic Hamilton systems and backward stochastic Riccati equations*, SIAM J. Control Optim. **42** (2003), no. 1, 53–75 (electronic).

[Tev08] R. Tevzadze, *Solvability of backward stochastic differential equations with quadratic growth*, Stochastic Process. Appl. **118** (2008), no. 3, 503–515.

[Udr94] C. Udrişte, *Convex functions and optimization methods on Riemannian manifolds*, Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 297, Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1994.

[Wid71] K.-O. Widman, *Hölder continuity of solutions of elliptic systems*, Manuscripta Math. **5** (1971), 299–308.

[Zha12] Y. Zhao, *Stochastic equilibria in a general class of incomplete brownian market environments*, Ph.D. thesis, The University of Texas at Austin, 2012.

[Žit12] G. Žitković, *An example of a stochastic equilibrium with incomplete markets*, Finance and Stochastics **16** (2012), no. 2, 177–206.

(Hao Xing) DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS, LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE, LONDON, UK

E-mail address: h.xing@lse.ac.uk

(Gordan Žitković) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN, AUSTIN, TX, USA

E-mail address: gordanz@math.utexas.edu